

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE prominence given to symbolism in religion has caused religious truth to be looked upon with suspicion by many. It is felt to be less dependable, less firmly grounded in reality than the well-established truths of science.

This whole subject, which is one of great importance, is finely treated in *Symbolism and Belief*, by Dr. EDWYN BEVAN (Allen & Unwin; 15s. net). This book contains the Gifford Lectures delivered in Edinburgh in 1933-34, and it merits, and will doubtless receive, the most careful attention from students of the subject. It is marked by profound insight, ripe thought, and a rare maturity of judgment. It is impossible in these notes to give any adequate idea of its wealth in historical and exegetical criticism, in philosophic and scientific argumentation, and in constructive religious thinking.

One point touched upon, but perhaps not sufficiently emphasized, is that physical science is as full of symbolism as religious thought. Max Planck, the greatest of scientists, says that the difference between the physical reality and the scientific representation of it is as great as the difference between a cow and the picture of a cow. 'Directly observable quantities do not appear at all in the world picture. It contains nothing but symbols.'

Accordingly the youthful preacher who tries to startle his people by announcing that the language

of the Apocalypse is nothing but symbol, as if that were specially true of that particular book, is not saying anything very enlightening or helpful. As a matter of fact there is no more symbolism in St. John's vision of the New Jerusalem than there is in Bohr's picture of the atom or Einstein's theory of relativity. They are all endeavouring, each in his own way, to picture the unpicturable.

From the days of the great Greek thinkers men have felt the difficulty of expressing in any worthy way their thoughts about God and the spiritual world, and they have been compelled to use imagery which may be called anthropomorphic. They have done this with quite open eyes because no other course was possible. It shows culpable ignorance, therefore, of the history of religious thought to suppose, as Julian Huxley and others do, that 'it is only very modern, relatively enlightened, thinkers in the Christian Church who are at last beginning to shed the traditional anthropomorphism.'

Plato knew perfectly well what he was doing when he put his highest truths in the form of myths, and Plotinus clearly indicates his own procedure. 'Since no phrase you can use about the Supreme is adequate to the Reality, all you can do is to throw out your phrase at It and then deny that the phrase is true. This leaves a kind of impression or idea in the hearer's mind, but at the same time prevents him from committing himself to it too fast and fixedly.'

The impossibility of getting rid of symbolism may be illustrated by reference to all the words denoting 'height' which are applied to God and to His home in heaven above and to all things that have value. To this topic Dr. Bevan has devoted two fascinating lectures. In speaking of the Most High God who dwells in heaven above there seems to be a focussing in one compound feeling of different aspects and implications of spacial height. There is the feeling of power as in a blow coming from above or in a man standing over another who is prostrate on the ground. There is the wider range of vision which elevation gives, and the consequent power to guide and command. There is also the feeling that to climb upwards is hard and the sky is an unattainable altitude. All these complex thoughts and feelings find appropriate expression in words indicative of spacial height, and they are not in the slightest degree affected, as some foolishly suppose, by Copernican astronomy or any scientific theory. They are inescapable. If we try to express ourselves in more abstract and philosophic language and speak of the 'transcendence' of God and the 'sublimity' of things divine, we discover that we are merely using Latin words expressive of spacial height.

The question may be raised as to what type of symbols it is best to use, whether the plain and homely symbols derived from material things and the experiences of daily life or the more abstract ideas of the philosopher, which, it should always be remembered, are just as full of symbolism as the former.

In this connexion the words of a French writer, Jean Guittou, may be quoted: 'Now since man cannot any way escape from the snares of metaphor, is it not well to have recourse to the homelier metaphors? Mythical imagery, used by a thinker who can subordinate it to his purpose, has in this respect an advantage. In the first place it can furnish instruction, telling and explicit, for the common man. And is there any real danger of its leading the wise man astray? The crying disproportion between the image and the reality it represents warns him that the words are only

expedients and makeshifts. Their very poverty helps him to realize that God is beyond every possible conception, every possible image.' But if more subtle language is used, and imagery derived from the working of the human mind, there is an insidious danger lest such language should be taken as more than symbolic, as adequate to the reality to be expressed. 'We shall never surmount the limits by which nature has circumscribed us. But while the mental anthropomorphism in assimilating the Divine mode of working to the measure of the human spirit is liable to lead astray, the material anthropomorphism is its own safeguard against its miserable inadequacy.'

Dean Mansel similarly animadverted on 'that morbid horror of what they are pleased to call anthropomorphism, which poisons the speculations of so many modern philosophers.' He pointed out that all speech about God is symbolic, and held that it was a mistake to suppose you could get to anything more literally true than the anthropomorphic imagery. 'We dishonour God far more by identifying Him with the feeble and negative impotence of thought which we are pleased to style the Infinite than by remaining content with those limits which He for His own good purposes has imposed upon us.' This preference for anthropomorphic imagery, then, is not the *naïveté* of the man who has never perceived its philosophical inadequacy, but the result of a scepticism pushed far enough to feel the inadequacy of all philosophical formulas offered as a substitute.

'We can see how, if Mansel is right, rational argument about God or the presentation of God's action in the documents of religion may be completely fallacious. Not because the Reality is itself irrational; we may believe that, if God and the actions of God could be known to finite minds, they would exhibit reason in its ultimate perfection, and yet believe that reasonings about God and His actions are fallacious. If all our notions of God are merely images which stand for an inconceivable Reality—counters, as it were, which more or less misrepresent that Reality—our reasonings are no more than the manipulation of such counters, and

the result we arrive at may be remote from the truth. We may have conducted the process of reasoning with flawless consistency all through, but we are operating all the time only with counters, not with the realities themselves.'

To this view of Mansel's Dr. BEVAN inclines to give general assent. It is a commonplace in theology that all our conceptions of God are utterly inadequate to the Reality, all our representations are only figures by which we strive to indicate the unimaginable. 'If this is so, Mansel is reasonable in contending that anthropomorphic imagery may give us the essence of the Reality better than an abstract metaphysical formula which will be just as much beset by the limitations of the human mind and may deceive by its pretence of superior knowledge.'

It would seem to follow from this that religious certitude comes not by processes of logical argumentation but rather is grounded and confirmed in practical experience. 'While our best conceptions of God remain symbols of a Reality we cannot imagine, it is because these conceptions, when acted on, produce a life of a certain quality, as compared with other conceptions of the universe, that the man who believes in God gains assurance that he does right in believing.'

This looks very like Pragmatism, but in reality it differs from the Pragmatic view in respect of the fact that religious faith bases itself upon a Reality which is believed to exist in absolute independence. 'Take the conception of God as a loving Father. Obviously such an idea of God is symbolic. But the Theist or Christian does not merely say, "Act as if there were a God who is a loving Father, and you will find certain desirable results follow" (that is Pragmatism): he says, "Act as if there were God who is a loving Father, and you will, in so doing, be making the right response to that which God really is." God is really of such a character that, if any of us could know Him as He is (which we cannot do) and then had to describe in human language to men upon earth what he saw, he would have to say, "What I see is indescribable, but if you think of God as a loving Father, I cannot put

the Reality to you in a better way than that; that is the nearest you can get.'"

In his recently published book, *Doctrines of the Creed* (reviewed elsewhere), Canon O. C. QUICK has a suggestive chapter on the relevance of belief in God. The modern world is asking with a new insistence the question which transcends every other in importance: Why should we believe in God at all? What is the real value of that belief which is at the centre of traditional religion? Briefly, the answer is that to believe in the one eternal God alone gives us the right to speak and think of the universe as being the universe at all. For, if there be no eternal reality above and beyond the changes and chances of temporal succession, 'the universe' is but a phrase fashioned by man for his convenience which merely falsifies the limitless multiplicity and variety of particular events extending for ever into the darkness of the unknown.

To believe in the goodness of the eternal alone enables us to hope that the tiny efforts any of us make after righteousness and truth can have any abiding consequence or value. For, if there be no eternal reality, the same result of dissolution and extinction will wait on all our achievements in the end. Only look far enough ahead, and selfishness and self-sacrifice, sin and holiness, delusion and enlightenment, will all come to the same thing. From such a conclusion belief in God affords the only possible deliverance, if we think coherently. Apart from all logical proofs of theism, therefore, and all doctrines of particular revelation and all mystical experience, the mind of man in its most clear-sighted moments will always retain the substance of belief in God, simply because any real rejection of it involves consequences which are intolerable alike to reason and conscience.

'Brave words,' the sceptic will reply, 'but how is it, then, that so many of the keenest and most influential intellects of our time reject your belief as obsolete and worthless?' This is a quite per-

tinient question, and must be answered. There are two reasons that explain why the central doctrines of religion are losing their appeal to the human mind. One is the belief which the last century established in general progress and evolution, a belief shared, though with important differences in form, by Marxists, Nationalists, and Humanitarians. To all alike the history of life on this planet is a story of constant development from lower to higher, and the development seems bound somehow to continue. In this respect there is a profound difference between the mind of the ancient and that of the modern world.

The ancients never entertained seriously the notion of general progress. They never saw any reason for thinking that what comes later must be better than what comes earlier. Their golden age was in the past, and any hope of betterment was based on the expectation of a divine intervention, not on the operation of any natural law. But now everybody has a belief in better times ahead. Time is the bringer of all good things, and this prospect provides faith and hope enough to carry people through the present. To seek a reason for this uncritical trust leads us to the second cause of the disfavour into which other-worldliness has fallen.

It is the new control which man by experimental science has won over Nature and is continually extending. The result of it is a quite new consciousness of power which has convinced our generation that human destiny is in human hands. However great may be the dangers, men are sure that they can escape them by the use of their own resources. Here is the great reason why traditional piety and belief in God make so little appeal to the modern world. Salvation lies in some political or economic gospel. For man can do everything that can be done at all by the knowledge and equipment which science puts ready for his use. We can afford to trust the future because there is no limit to what man can do with it. It is this new Titanism of man which has thrust God out of mind and blinded our eyes to the ultimate ends and issues of human living.

Yet it is becoming increasingly evident that modern godlessness must bring what ancient heathenism used to call a nemesis upon its head. When men have abandoned all belief in unchanging and eternal authority over human life, they can reach no agreement as to what ultimate end they ought to pursue, or by what means it is right to pursue it. When there is no agreement on such matters, the appeal is inevitably to force. Accordingly it is to the use of force, physical and psychical, that the adherents of the new gospels betake themselves.

But even the modern world is not allowed to forget that those who take the sword perish with the sword, since force constantly begets force in opposition to itself. And therefore the majority of us live in terror of war, civil, international or economic, which, as experience has shown, must under modern conditions bring disaster to all and victory to none. Of course co-operation could save us. But where is the power that would enable us to co-operate? Government control of press, wireless and education is the modern answer to that question. But official propaganda can only deceive the citizens of one State at a time, and a policy of systematic lying can but increase in the end the confusion it sought to remedy.

But about end and means. We have just said that when belief in eternal realities is abandoned, men can reach no agreement as to the ultimate end they ought to pursue or by what means it is right to pursue it. Well, observe what is actually happening in both respects. As to the end: man's destiny being in his own hands and no authority set over him, what end should he live for, what future should he make for himself? Some say, the establishment of a classless society. Others believe in the dominance of one nation or race over others. And so we have the rival gospels of Communism and Nationalism arrayed against each other. What court is to decide between them? There can be no appeal to any eternal principles of right or justice or truth. Nothing can arbitrate but force. And when the guns and

bombs and poison gas have done their work, will it matter which side claims victory?

And as to the *means*: if you believe in an eternal principle of right and goodness, the means you take to achieve your good end must be the expression of the same goodness, and morally appropriate to it. If the end is a divine kingdom of righteousness and peace and love, the means you take to move towards it must themselves be the appropriate expression of a righteous, peaceable and loving spirit. For the end you seek is set by eternal principles which lay their authority upon you now.

But if you believe only in some *future* good as the end, there is no reason why your choice of means should be thus limited. Why should not the classless society, which is the Marxist's heaven, be sought by deliberately creating the ruthless dictatorship of the proletariat backed by the methods of the Ogpu? Why should not the noble civilization of the Nationalist's dream issue from an utterly sordid persecution of the Jews? Once men have thoroughly rejected the thought of the Divine, the other-worldly and the eternal, they will inevitably think that they can justify the blackest crimes in the present, because their result will be some glorious Utopia in the future.

Christians think otherwise. St. Paul's teaching at this point makes a particularly instructive contrast to that of some modern missionaries. He also looked for a glorious age in the future. The Kingdom of God is righteousness and joy and peace in the Holy Ghost; and no doubt he was thinking primarily of a future world. But the Kingdom was God's; and therefore it was not future only, but eternal. Therefore, again, he who would enter it fully in the future must begin to enter it now by living according to its law of love even in face of suffering persecution and apparent failure. There is indeed a bringing of good out of evil, of which the Cross of Christ is the sacrament; but the Christian dialectic depends on the eternal consistency of God's love.

And so we return to the essential meaning and

value of belief in God. It is not the mere clinging, for comfort and guidance, to the orthodoxy of the past. It is not a bulwark against revolution. Modern society is far too like the world which the New Testament condemns not to stand in need of a revolution as drastic as any Communist could wish. Belief in God is the conviction that we may enter now into communion with that living and eternal will of goodness which, because it is above the changes and chances of time, can alone give meaning to their movement and order them towards an end.

A new book by Professor ERNEST F. SCOTT, D.D., of Union Theological Seminary, is sure of a good welcome. The book before us, *The Validity of the Gospel Record* (Nicholson & Watson; 8s. 6d. net), is the most recent addition to the publishers' series known as 'The International Library of Christian Knowledge.' It represents the author's views on the recent methods of research as applied to the Gospels, particularly on what is known as Form Criticism; and it is written in a clear and popular style.

In the author's opinion much has been done by modern criticism to push farther back, though not to dispel, the darkness which conceals the primitive tradition. The account of Jesus, it may now be said, was first transmitted orally, and consisted of a great number of separate anecdotes and sayings. This record belonged to the community and was preserved in it. It was thus saved from the caprice of individual reporters. While it was still in the oral phase it came to be moulded according to set patterns, to be invested with more or less conventional forms.

'The Meaning of Form' is one of the author's most topical chapters. There he allows that the recent investigation of form has marked a real advance in Gospel criticism. It may be that too much has been claimed for the new method, and that most of its findings will always remain more or less conjectural. But at least a crevice has been

opened through which we can see some little way into the background of oral tradition.

The forms in which the record is cast are demonstrably artificial, and it might be concluded that the substance of it has also passed through a process. But when we find a community which called itself by the name of Jesus and sought to order its life by His precepts, we may conclude that its account of Him is substantially true. If the Roman Empire was based on ideas which it ascribed to Cæsar, the natural assumption is that Cæsar was a real person who originated those ideas and with them the Empire which preserved his story.

Artificial though the forms are, they may be in harmony with facts. Any narrator will be found to develop a technique of his own, and the form is usually most rigid when the narrative is most matter-of-fact. 'One has only to think of a business letter, a captain's log-book, a policeman's evidence in court, a scientific demonstration.' Indeed artificial form may be said to be the mark of veracity. In the East, more especially, a loose, flexible mode of narration would cause misgiving.

Forms would be adopted when the danger of corruption of the tradition had become apparent, but could still be overcome; and the transposition into form may be taken to mark the true beginning of a Gospel literature. The record did not shape itself automatically, but was shaped by teachers who understood the finer uses of language. While

the chief object of formulation was to preserve and fix the tradition, the further motive was involved of laying hold of those things which it was most desirable to keep.

What determined the selection? Preference would be given to acts and sayings of Jesus which bore more immediately on the present needs of the Church, to incidents which lent confirmation to the beliefs of the Church, especially the central belief that Jesus was the Messiah. But our Gospels are also full of passages which only by a forced ingenuity can be construed as topical, passages which bring out the spiritual value of the story of Jesus and the newness and splendour of His teaching.

In addition to these reasons determining the selection of material Dr. SCOTT names also anxiety on the part of Christian teachers to transmit an authentic record. It was a matter of practical concern to the Church to become acquainted with the Gospel history. It is not to be supposed, however, that the historical tests which Christian teachers employed were of just the same kind as we should use now. 'As yet there was no clear conception of the laws of historical evidence, no means of determining whether an event was possible within the order of nature.' But if, as appears most likely, the various sections of the record were designed for public recital at the church meeting, we have a strong guarantee that they were framed carefully, with a full sense of responsibility. Nothing that was false or unworthy could be admitted into the worship of the assembled brotherhood.

The Missionary Prophet.

BY THE REVEREND J. H. MORRISON, D.D., BUCKSBURN, ABERDEEN.

IN the popular mind the Book of Jonah is associated with some ridiculous story about a whale, but to those who have insight and sympathy to discern its real meaning and intention no book in the Old Testament is more astonishing, more sublime, more worthy of reverence. It is years since Cornill wrote of it: 'I have read the Book of Jonah at least a hundred times, and I will publicly avow, for I am not ashamed of my weakness, that I cannot even now take up this marvellous book, nay, nor even speak of it, without the tears rising to my eyes, and my heart beating higher. This apparently trivial book is one of the deepest and grandest that was ever written, and I should like to say to every one who approaches it, "Take off thy shoes, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."'

It is a book written to teach the universality of God's redeeming love and to enlarge the sympathies of God's people towards all mankind. It was directed in the first instance against Jewish pride and exclusiveness which regarded all heathen nations as lying under the wrath of God and doomed to destruction. The discipline of the Exile, instead of broadening, had narrowed their minds so that later Judaism became more intensely bigoted and exclusive than before. There were illustrious exceptions, and perhaps the greatest of these was the writer of the Book of Jonah. A profoundly thoughtful and religious mind, a truly Christlike spirit, he pondered deeply the meaning of all God's dealings with His chosen people, and especially the significance of the Exile. He worked out under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit a philosophy of Jewish history which though clothed in weird imagery contains lessons of priceless value for the Church of every age.

He embodied his message in a story or parable, not simply because that was a popular form of teaching in the East where it is firmly believed that

Truth embodied in a tale
Shall enter in at lowly doors,

but doubtless also because the subject was so highly controversial and provocative that it could hardly bear to be set forth in formal argument. Moreover, it is not an argument we have here, but a tender appeal to the heart.

The first step towards an understanding of the book is to interpret its strange symbolism, strange to us but familiar enough to those for whom it was first written. That Jonah the prophet should represent Israel is quite in accordance with Old Testament usage, for Israel is frequently spoken of in the singular as God's servant or prophet. But the name Jonah is specially apt and well chosen, for it literally means 'a dove,' the messenger of peace, and there are passages where Israel is spoken of by that name (Hos 7¹¹ 11¹¹, also probably in the title of Ps 56, which is taken in the Talmud and LXX as referring to Israel in exile). The great fish or sea monster prepared by God is a familiar Hebrew image to denote a heathen empire or power of evil. Every reader of Daniel or the Book of Revelation is acquainted with this style of prophetic speech. Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel all refer to the heathen empires of their day as devouring monsters which God has prepared according to His purpose, which He rules and bridles and which He will finally overthrow. Particularly in Jer 51 there is the closest parallel to the Book of Jonah, where it is said, 'the king of Babylon hath devoured me . . . he hath swallowed me up like a dragon . . . I will bring forth out of his mouth that which he hath swallowed up.' Nothing could more fitly picture the catastrophe of the Exile when God's people were swallowed up, and the miracle of the Return when contrary to all human expectation the monster was made to disgorge his prey. Nineveh was in its day the great city of the heathen world whose downfall was hailed by the Jews and all the oppressed nations with delirious joy as can be read in the Book of Nahum. Its name is compounded of an Assyrian word meaning 'a fish,' so that all these things would very naturally suggest to the prophet's mind the parable of the great fish.

Once the story is looked at in this way it ceases to be grotesque. It is seen to deal with great historic events and religious principles. We can read it, as we read in the *Pilgrim's Progress* of Apollyon and of Giant Despair, without any sense of incongruity but with appreciation and spiritual profit. Like John Bunyan the writer of the Book of Jonah has an exceedingly fine touch and an unerring instinct. Every stroke of the brush tells,

and his work can bear to be examined minutely for it is significant down to the last detail. The broad outline of its teaching may be set down as follows.

1. *God's World-wide Purpose of Salvation.* The mission of Jonah to Nineveh is Israel's mission to the heathen world. For nothing less than this high destiny was Israel called and chosen. This was in view from the beginning. The blessing of Abraham had a universal reference, and prophetic souls felt that there could be no bounds to God's Kingdom. So they sang :

The beam that shines from Sion hill
Shall lighten ev'ry land ;
The King who reigns in Salem's tow'rs
Shall all the world command.

This prophetic instinct and this sense of a world-wide mission has become in the Church of the New Testament an explicit command. 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.' This is the very end for which the Church exists, and to deny it is to deny the faith.

2. *The Church's Failure.* Jonah refused to obey the divine command and sought to evade his mission. When bidden to go to the East he set out to flee to the remotest West, so completely did he set his face against the will of God. Here is a faithful portrait of the narrowness and bigotry of the Jewish Church which had no sympathy with the heathen, nor any desire for their salvation. On the contrary, there was a grim satisfaction in the thought that the heathen world was ripening for judgment, and Israel exulted in the anticipation of their day of doom. It was an attitude which made friendly intercourse impossible, quenched the missionary spirit, and frustrated the redeeming purpose of God. Not only in the Jewish but also in the Christian Church, as we must sadly confess, there are too many traces of this same attitude and spirit. We may not openly argue, as did some of the Post-Reformation Churches, that the Great Commission to go into all the world was the *personale privilegium* of the Apostles and no longer binding on the Church, but in practice we ignore it and take means to evade our Christian duty.

Jonah's disobedience to the divine command speedily brings him into deep waters. 'There was a mighty tempest in the sea, so that the ship was like to be broken.' When the seamen cast lots to determine for whose cause the trouble had arisen, the lot fell upon Jonah, and he confessed the justice of the decision. 'I know that for my sake this great tempest is upon you.' It is the lesson of

Israel's history, a lesson which the prophets were never weary of enforcing, that if only God's people would walk in His ways and fulfil His will, then would their peace be like a river and their righteousness like the waves of the sea. But when they rebelled against God's will then they brought trouble and sorrow upon themselves and upon the world. How different ancient history might have been if Israel had been a dove of peace among the nations !

The world of to-day is a storm centre, and the question arises, Who is responsible ? Whatever others may say, the Church at least must be willing in a spirit of sincere penitence to take her full share of the blame. If the Church had cordially accepted and fulfilled her mission, if Christendom had been genuinely Christian and actively missionary, how different the state of the world would have been. Time and again, as history records, tragic failures on the part of the Church have involved the world in a sea of troubles. The corruptions and idolatries of the Early Mediæval Church provoked the reaction of Mohammedanism with all its bloody sequel of wars and persecutions down to the present day. There was a time, too, when the cause of Christ in China was in a most hopeful state, and the Emperor appealed to the Pope for missionaries, but got in reply a bottle of holy water ! Or to come to our own day, how much of the blame lies at the door of the Church for all the sea of bloodshed into which the peoples of Russia and of Spain have been plunged ? It is terrible to think that great nations, after being under the tutelage of the Church for centuries, should rise up in wrath to throw that Church overboard. Or to come still nearer home, had Protestant Britain given to the extension of Christ's kingdom a tithe of the energy she devoted to imperial expansion, might she not have been God's messenger of peace to all mankind ? But she went her own way, to amass wealth and power and territory, and so instead of friendship she stirred great nations to envy and hatred which plunged the world into war and the present sea of troubles. It might be the beginning of better things if the Church would come together in sincere penitence and make confession before the whole world, saying, 'I know that for my sake this great tempest is upon you.'

3. *The Heathen world* is painted with wonderful sympathy, a sympathy rare indeed among the Jews. Look at the sailors, what fine fellows they are ! How decent in their treatment of Jonah, and how humane ! Even when they know he is

to blame they won't throw him overboard till they have done their utmost to save him. When the Jews were scattered abroad they must have met with many kind and neighbourly people, for there are such people in every age and country. A kindly tea-planter, looking down on a pretty Scottish village, exclaimed, 'I have as many decent hard-working folk in my tea garden as you have down in that village.' To go abroad in a proud spirit, despising the native and brutally saying, 'He understands nothing but the boot,' is the gravest sin and crime against humanity. The heathen have just the same human nature as we have, the same faults and the same virtues.

Moreover, they are religious, and often a reproach to God's people by their devotion. The heathen sailors are at their prayers while Jonah is asleep. Time and again the prophets urge this against Israel that the heathen are more devout. In their blindness they may 'bow down to wood and stone,' but they *do* bow, they have the religious instinct in the highest degree, and they seek after God with an earnestness which may well put God's own people to shame. No wonder then that the gospel, when it comes to such kindly and instinctively religious people, wakens a response. When Jonah preaches to Nineveh, though his message is of judgment rather than of mercy, Nineveh repents. How often has this miracle been repeated down through the Christian ages, and not least in our own time. Cannibals have been won for Christ, and races so degraded as to be counted sub-human have been raised and changed. So that there is now on record, for all who care to read it, abundant and triumphant proof that God's message can touch the universal heart of man, and that the gospel is indeed the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth.

4. Finally, *God's infinite pity is movingly set forth.* Jonah was only half converted, as the Church still is on the subject of missions. Jonah had carried out his mission as a duty, but with little faith and love. He is disappointed that Nineveh should escape judgment upon its sins. He is jealous of that heathen city getting a share of God's favour. He is like the elder brother in the parable who, when he heard the music that welcomed the prodigal's return, 'was angry and would not go in.' This was not only the attitude of the Jewish Church generally but it depicts the feelings of many in the Apostolic Church who could not believe it possible that God had 'granted

to the gentiles repentance unto life.' It takes a high degree of the grace of God to purge the heart from such feelings. It is so natural to feel jealous and resentful when peoples and races, which have been counted inferior, claim a share in the Christian heritage and an equal standing within the Christian brotherhood. Missionaries of experience have confessed that what they found hardest of all was to preach the gospel without condescension and in a genuine spirit of brotherly love.

But the prophet's narrowness is rebuked by the infinite pity and patience of God. He looks down on Nineveh and sees not merely its heathenism but its home life, not merely its kings and warriors but the masses of its toiling people, its scores of thousands of helpless infants, even its dumb animals. Nothing kindles sympathy like the actual sight of helplessness and suffering. When we see thousands of little Spanish children brought weeping to our shores every heart is moved. But the heathen are far away and no concern of ours, we think. Because we do not actually see we do not acutely feel. If we could but see as God sees, then perhaps we should learn in some degree to pity as He pities. It is indeed a sublime picture which is here given of God's pity for Nineveh, and a picture which brings comfort to the heart. These ancient cities and civilizations have long since gone down to the dust, without knowledge of the true God and Saviour, but all the while His watchful eye was upon them and His fatherly love brooded over them, and they all have fallen into His hands who, as Jonah confessed, is 'a gracious God, and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness.' And there we leave them.

But if any should imagine that this is reason why we may leave the heathen of our day to the uncovenanted mercies of God, then let it be noted that God's pity for Nineveh expressed itself in sending to them His Word through the mouth of His servant Jonah. Nineveh was not saved without Jonah; his preaching brought them to repentance, and made them fit to receive God's mercy. Even so is the Church of to-day commissioned and enjoined to carry the saving word to the heathen world, and through that message to become the means of salvation to all mankind. It is a work of infinite value which may avert wars and sufferings and judgments untold. If that work be neglected and left undone, then the question may be, not about the final destiny of the heathen, but whether the Church itself can be saved.

What Jesus made of Men.¹

BY THE REVEREND EDWARD SHILLITO, M.A., B.A., BUCKHURST HILL, ESSEX.

THE reader who seeks to discover in the Gospels what Jesus thought of men, and how He dealt with them, will find an answer both consistent and arresting. Jesus, as He was remembered in the Early Church, had a way of His own in dealing with individual men and women. In a study of this way it is not necessary to enter upon critical problems; the evidence is too widely spread and too convincing to admit of any doubt that such was the mind of Jesus, as His people remembered Him. He left them in no doubt of what He made of man.

It is clear that when some individual man came into personal dealings with Him, He looked first of all with an unprejudiced eye upon him; He was not prepared to classify him finally with a larger company; He does not appear to have made much use of the labels, which were in use in His day, but He was not in the least blind to the plain realities to which these labels bore witness. It was a matter of importance whether a man was a Jew or a Gentile, but only on a certain level of life. There was a deeper level with which He was concerned. On that level there is neither Jew nor Greek even as there is neither male nor female.

I.

In St. Matthew there is, to take the first illustration, the story of the Roman centurion, who besought Jesus to heal his boy. The man, as he approached Jesus, could be described according to his race, class, profession, wealth, and even religion. But in his dealing with Jesus he revealed what he was upon another and deeper level. He showed what our Lord was always seeking, and finding in strange places.

‘The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof; but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed.’²

There was in him that singleness of mind which leads a man to be ready to venture all upon a call,

¹ Mt 8³⁻¹³ 16¹⁵⁻¹⁸, Lk 19⁹⁻¹⁰ 23⁴²⁻⁴³.

² Mt 8⁸.

that comes to him with authority. He was among the pure in heart who shall see God.

That mattered supremely; on the other levels of his life he might be justly and usefully described as a Roman, a pagan, a soldier, a master of a household; but when Jesus descended to that deeper level in which faith is revealed, He did not let the other classifications modify His verdict:

‘When Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.’

Then, as always, beginning from the one life before Him, Jesus let His imagination go forward into the future. He saw in this man the forerunner of a great multitude of men, like-minded with him, who would come into the Kingdom of Heaven from the East and West. It was not only of the tragedy of Israel as He saw it, when the children of the Kingdom should be cast out into outer darkness, that He was thinking; but of the members of the new Israel who should march with the light of faith in their eyes into the blessed Kingdom. Only one man, and that man an alien from the Israel as men knew it! Jesus saw in that one man the promise of the new Israel of which such men as that would be the first-born.

II.

There is that same method revealed in the story of the confession of Simon at Cæsarea Philippi.

‘And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.

And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.’³

The Simon who comes into this scene could be

³ Mt 16¹⁸⁻¹⁹.

described in perfectly correct terms as a Galilean and a fisherman; he has been somewhat extravagantly called by Mr. Chesterton, 'a shuffler, a snob, and a coward'; at least it must be admitted that in the story he is known as a man of impulsive moods, taking his colour from his company. The rock, so far, was a hidden rock. But once more Jesus had penetrated to that level upon which faith is revealed. That made all the difference in His eyes. There was only one man before him, and that man only on the threshold of the new life, but Jesus saw a Church. Whatever these difficult words may mean, they must imply that in the Early Church it was not thought impossible or even strange that Jesus in His earthly life should look upon a man who had shown faith and see—a Church rising, because of that man's confession and the faith which blazed up in that moment.

When Robert Louis Stevenson wrote to his mother about his friend, James Chalmers, the missionary whom he called, as the Papuans did, Tamate, he said: 'He has plenty faults like the rest of us, but he is big as a Church.' There was something of the same imaginative insight in these words, as that which can be discovered in the words of our Lord. Whatever else there is in these words, there is this at least; Jesus was not prepared to read the personality of Simon by what we should call the card-indexes in common use. Simon, yielding to the Voice which had spoken to him, was a new fact in the life of the world, and new hopes and promises were to be released in him: in his blood 'the great age slept sepulchred.' Now Jesus saw the stone rolled away.

III.

The story of Zacchæus reveals the same fearless method and the same vision. It is a story perfect in the economy of language. The picture has very few lines. Yet no one can mistake the truth that is set forth in it. Zacchæus was well known, and put in his right place in Jericho. He was a publican, to be numbered among the sinners and outcasts, more to be despised than even a dog of a Gentile. He was treated as an enemy of society:

'And, behold, there was a man named Zacchæus, which was the chief among the publicans, and he was rich.

And he sought to see Jesus who he was; and could not for the press, because he was little of stature.

And he ran before, and climbed up into a

sycomore tree to see him: for he was to pass that way.'¹

The story would certainly not have been preserved unless there had been in it an illustration of something characteristic of Jesus, as He was remembered. It is not the story of a miracle of healing, but of what might have been rightly called a miracle of spiritual healing. It must have seemed one out of many examples of such acts of healing. But the story would be without meaning if there was not in the publican the beginnings of a capacity for the new life. There was a hidden Zacchæus, whom no one in Jericho suspected to be there. It is simply said that he sought to see Jesus; such seeking might be little more than curiosity, but all the human quest for knowledge began with curiosity; and such curiosity as Zacchæus showed had within it the seed of faith.

When Jesus passed that way He saw a face in the sycomore tree; but it was not the face of a publican and a sinner, but the face of the hidden and unknown Zacchæus. The card-index of Jericho was correct as far as it went. But it did not describe that other level upon which Jesus looked. He came to seek one who was lost.

The familiar story ends with the words:

'And Jesus said unto him, This day is salvation come to this house, forsomuch as he also is a son of Abraham.

For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.'²

Upon the significance of this saying of Jesus much might be said by the critical student; but as it is used in this story, it must mean that Jesus had found in Zacchæus a son of Abraham waiting to be released. That hidden Zacchæus had been lost in the heart of a human society in the city of Jericho. Jesus had come to seek and to save such lost souls. Nothing more was needed than the dawning of faith. Jesus saw a new vision of that city to which Zacchæus belonged. It was made the richer by the entrance into it of a son of Abraham. Salvation came to the house of that publican. But salvation could not be understood without the vision of what it would involve for other lives. The presence in Jericho of a new Zacchæus would be a new fact in the life of the city. One penitent publican! But Jesus saw more than that one man. He looked into the future, and saw the way that lay before that man, and what his new life would bring. All that future He had seen in promise

¹ Lk 19²⁻⁴.

² Lk 19^{9, 10}.

when He looked at the face looking down upon Him from the sycomore tree. Given the rudiments of faith, the rest followed.

It is the same Jesus dealing in the same way with Zacchæus as He had done with the Roman centurion and with Simon.

To the last He followed the same quest and showed the same freedom and daring.

What if there were no future for the soul upon this earth? What, then, could He see as He looked into the future? The story of the Dying Thief has been told countless times for the comfort of those whose time is short. It has been read as though it taught the lesson:

Between the saddle and the ground,
He mercy sought and mercy found.

Yet as the story was told to the first hearers, it must have meant more than that. It tells how Jesus carried forward the life of the Thief into the unseen.

‘And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.

And Jesus said unto him, Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.’¹

This is rightly called a story of faith, and it was the faith, which to Jesus was the one thing needful. ‘To see, in the white, worn, bleeding flesh of a crucified convict, the Lord of Life and of Death, was no exercise of ordinary, or scientific, reason in the mind of the penitent thief. But it was true insight, as true, not the less but the more, for that.’ ‘The difference was a moral and spiritual difference between the many who saw in Jesus crucified, a detected and defeated impostor, and the one who there bowed his soul in homage, and in prayer, to the Lord and King of the Life which is beyond death.’² It was, once more, on this level that the penitent thief and the Lord met. Jesus did not see in the dying man by His side a desperate brigand, perhaps a nationalist outlaw, paying for his wild and lawless deeds by his death. The one thing that mattered in that hour was the man’s faith. On the level which was revealed this man showed insight, the insight which came from faith. That was enough.

‘This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.’

¹ Lk 23^{42, 43}.

² R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*.

To others Jesus had said, ‘Go to your home, and tell what great things God hath done for you.’ He could not say such words to this man. Any future for him must be found beyond the bounds of time and place. Yet on the Cross the Saviour, knowing the faith of the dying man, looked into the future before him. This also was remembered by the Early Church in the records of Calvary; Jesus in dying had traced out for this companion of His a future scene, in which his faith would be unfolded. He who had looked so often into the new life for others on this earth into which their faith would lead them, now at the end still looked forward, only now upon that other shore.

‘This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.’

In one of the noblest religious poems of this age, J. S. Phillimore³ wrote to the honour of the good thief, who by St. Cyprian was reckoned among the martyrs who are baptized in their own blood. This poem is true to the spirit of the Gospels, and not the less true because of its very daring.

Did ever paladin adventuring out

To face the great uncharted enterprise,
Choose for companion in the crucial bout

A sorrier squire with whom to agonize?

Yet in that earthquake-darkened afternoon
Of dereliction, when the seventh sword

So pierced the Dolorous Mother’s heart that she
Was fallen dumb in swoon,

Thou midst the railers didst salute thy Lord,
Thou hadst the heart to cry, *Remember me*.

‘Thou shalt be with me in Paradise.’ It was a fitting close to that Divine Life that our Lord should go forth into the unseen with this man for whom the world had no use. It was like Him, as He is pictured to us, to see in that man by His side a companion to be with Him when the long agony was over. He could see beyond the horizon of this earthly life. For Him there was no call to despair even though to such penitence as He knew the Thief could give no expression in this life. It was too late for that now. But the imagination of Jesus was not bounded by death. It is still true that there can be no belief in the sacredness of the individual human life which does not rest upon a belief in the eternal world and in the God who is not the God of the dead but of the living.

Wherever we pause to reflect upon the memorabilia of Jesus, we find Him always the same in His

³ *Things New and Old*.

dealings with men. He is always a realist, not one of the 'vision-weaving tribe.' He is always in quest of that other and deeper level of which the judgments in common use take little account. He is always free from bondage to the merely outward and conventional judgments. He is a merchant-man seeking for one treasure which far outvalues all others. When He finds that treasure, Faith, He can see it in its unfoldings in this life and beyond. He can read the future of a multitude in one man; He can see a Church rising when one man confesses Him: He can see a Son of Abraham when one publican looks curiously upon Him, and in a dying brigand He can see a companion with whom to cross the threshold of the unseen world.

That is the picture of the Lord whom men re-

membered. It is little wonder that they have said of Him:

For oh, the Master is so fair,
His smile so sweet to banished men,
That they who meet Him unaware,
Can never rest on earth again.

And they who see Him ris'n afar
At God's right hand to welcome them,
Forgetful stand of home and land,
Remembering Jerusalem.

There is also judgment in His clear eyes, but it is never a judgment divorced from faith and hope and love. Men when they bowed beneath His judgment never doubted His eager quest of them, nor the vision that He had of them.

Literature.

DOCTRINES OF THE CREED.

CANON OLIVER C. QUICK, M.A., D.D., has just produced a book of remarkable interest and value—*Doctrines of the Creed: Their Basis in Scripture and their Meaning To-day* (Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net). Canon Quick is Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham, and this volume is no doubt part of the fruit of his prelections in that seat of learning. He describes the book as an essay in systematic theology, and makes a careful discrimination between systematic theology and dogmatic theology. The latter concerns itself mainly with the genesis and original significance of traditional dogma, and, in so far as it turns its attention from the past to the present, it seeks only to answer the question: What does the Church teach as *de fide*? On the other hand systematic theology asks the question: How can we best understand and interpret as a coherent whole the doctrinal tradition of our church in relation to that particular world in which we are now called upon to uphold the Christian faith?

If that somewhat unusual distinction be real, it is obvious that it must be very difficult to maintain it in actual practice. And indeed Dr. Quick hardly succeeds in doing so. It is impracticable to commend a doctrine to our intelligence without a reference to its original significance and to its genesis.

And indeed it is difficult to present a doctrine persuasively without offering a defence of it. And we are not surprised, or disappointed, to find both dogmatic theology and apologetics in this able and suggestive essay. But in the main Dr. Quick may quite justly claim that the purpose inherent in systematic theology has been the main purpose of his lectures.

The book has four parts, expounding the four great doctrines of the Creed: The Christian Faith in God, The Incarnation, The Christian Doctrine of Salvation, and The Holy Spirit and the Church. Under these headings all the main issues raised for belief are faced and explored with a grasp and insight that furnish a sustained intellectual satisfaction. As a proof of the thoroughness of the treatment of these themes it may be mentioned that in the second section of the book we have discussions of the Jewish background of Christology, a particularly able refutation of the supposed Hellenic influence on St. Paul, a chapter on 'The Incarnation and Historical Criticism,' an intelligent but unsatisfactory chapter on the Virgin Birth, as well as brief consideration of such points as our Lord's knowledge in His earthly life. The one marked omission is any direct reference to the doctrine of Scripture. It is true that the whole book is an exposition of Scripture teaching, but it would naturally be expected that the belief in the

Bible itself on which the doctrines of the Creed finally rest should be presented 'in relation to that particular world in which we are now called upon to uphold the Christian faith.' Even if the 'creeds' do not specifically contain a doctrine of Scripture, the particular world in which we live very much needs a justification of our belief in it.

One criticism which is more serious concerns the apologetic side of Dr. Quick's presentation of doctrine. This may be best put in a concrete instance. In his chapter on the Virgin Birth, after explaining (inadequately) the evidence on both sides, for and against, Dr. Quick sums up as follows: 'The historical evidence being inconclusive, it is theology which must determine our belief whether or not the Virgin Birth is a historical fact. If the Virgin Birth seems to us to be an integral of the Christian gospel, and in particular of the doctrine of the Incarnation, we shall naturally and reasonably affirm it.' That is an extraordinary position. And the attitude in it is taken in other parts of the argument. To many not unsympathetic and not unresponsive readers it will appear a definite weakness. But it need not be too much emphasized. What ought to be said is that this book, by one of the ablest theologians in the Anglican Church, is an important and in many ways brilliant contribution to theology for which we may well be profoundly grateful.

RELIGION IN SOCIAL ACTION.

Religion in Social Action, by Mr. Maurice B. Reckitt, M.A. (Unicorn Press; 3s. 6d. net), is a very valuable addition to the Christian Challenge series. 'My theme,' says the author, 'is the task of the Church in the world situation of to-day.' The book might be roughly divided into two parts: diagnosis and prescription.

Mr. Reckitt's diagnosis of the world situation to-day is that it is far too serious to admit of cure by any nostrum so simple as 'a new spirit' in industry or in international affairs. The Church has always a prophetic duty to indicate the real ends of social and economic life; but, since the Renaissance, it has abdicated from its throne, with the result that economic life has been considered as an end in itself rather than a means to the well-being of men and women as children of God. Thus it is not merely a new spirit within the framework of the present system which is required; it is a radically new direction, a change of structure to answer the change of heart. Christianity cannot join forces with Fascism or Communism, but it is

also critical of secularist democracy—for all these philosophies rest on a non-Christian conception of man.

The problem of war is treated in a similar manner. Not committing himself to pacifism, the author says that the main problem is not how to deal with the apparently quite unreasonable wickedness of individuals and groups who cause wars. The real question is, why are the nations inevitably drifting towards war in spite of the herculean efforts of statesmen to prevent it? Is the reason not that our economic life is aiming at wrong, and really impossible, ends? 'Does any one,' he asks, 'believe that a population enjoying reasonable security, able to consume or exchange all or most of what it would make . . . could be worked up to the pitch of hysterical immolation which the physically and psychically starved populations of Italy and Germany have now reached?'

Mr. Reckitt is not just dishing up once more the old doctrine of economic determinism, for he believes that the secularist view of society is the foundation of the bankrupt economic system, and that it is part of the prophetic duty of the Church radically to challenge this view of society. The economist's task is really to see what means are best fitted to secure the ends legislated for him by religion.

No full account can here be given of the author's prescription for the disease. His fundamental principle is found in a statement of F. D. Maurice, 'Society is not to be made anew by arrangements of ours, but is to be regenerated by finding the law and ground of its order and harmony, the only secret of its existence, in God.'

The aims of the Christian community to-day must be threefold.

Firstly, social revolution. This is to be achieved in a manner different from the violence of the contemporary revolutionary movements—and without the illusive hope that it will put an end to the moral and practical problems of man as a social being. But it will allow those problems to be seen in their true nature, and to be met with a new energy of mind and spirit.

Secondly, direct action against such evils as malnutrition and bad housing and local unemployment. Christians should bring Christian standards of judgment to bear upon the political causes and social programmes which they support, and must bring an informed interest to bear upon problems of local administration with the same objects.

Thirdly, first aid. We must remember that social problems concern us as Christians because they involve men and women created in God's image,

and must take action accordingly through social service or corporal works of mercy.

This is a fine book, full of careful statement and thought. If there be a criticism to make, it is this. Mr. Reckitt is speaking of the task of the Church in the world situation of to-day, and no doubt he takes for granted the duty of the Church to evangelize. But we are just too apt to take it for granted, and not realize how inadequately we are doing it. In order that the Christian Church should do its duty in this world situation it is first necessary that there should be a virile and active Christian Church. Mr. Reckitt has seen the great weakness of an evangelism that was not revolutionary enough—that was willing and content to seek for a Christian spirit within a framework of society that was anything but Christian. But on his side he neglects to notice the necessity for evangelism which should be undertaken by the Christian Community. Certainly under the heading of 'Direct Action' he does not suggest the inclusion of such evangelistic work. Perhaps in his reference to the need of Christian 'cells' to parallel the Communist cells he includes such work as part of the duty of these cells, but his language is ambiguous.

But this is the only criticism which can be offered of a book which is a piece of fine, clear, independent thinking, and is worth reading and re-reading.

WESLEY'S ENGLAND.

Dr. J. H. Whiteley has written an absorbingly interesting book on the England of Wesley—*Wesley's England* (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net). It is packed with useful information, and gives a realistic picture of the life and manners of the eighteenth century. Here we have information about population and roads, about work and workers, about government, law and order, about the literature of the period, education, church and chapel. Dr. Whiteley has a detailed and accurate knowledge of the period, and handles his material with great skill. His work shows careful research, and brings to our notice a good deal of out-of-the-way information. By reading this book we can live in the days of Wesley and become citizens of that period.

It was a century of growth in population. 'The century saw its population increase from five and a half millions to over nine; a stupendous progression when the very high rates of mortality then prevailing are remembered.'

The more this book is studied the more shall we realize how much the century needed a revival. Here we see the segregation of the classes—the

small band of educated men, the drunken squires, the hunting parsons, and the great mass of ignorant people. There were only two courses open to England—Revolution or Revival. By the grace of God change came by Revival. Dr. Whiteley shows us the heavy drinking habits of this age, 'when Pitt's love for port enabled him, as he expressed it, "always to see two Speakers when addressing the House."' He takes us to the gambling clubs of the west of London, where we see the aristocracy at play. He tells us that 'Before he was twenty-four years old Fox owed the Jews £100,000 lost at cards and dice.' Another chief evil of the period was the drinking of gin. 'Ale houses had to be licensed, but the sale of gin was to all intents and purposes unchecked. . . . By 1750 Fielding was declaring: "gin is the principal sustenance of more than 1,000,000 people in the metropolis."'

Dr. Whiteley gives us a most interesting chapter on the speech of the eighteenth century: it will be of great help to all who are students of words, and will shed some light on the question of rhyme. It is, of course, possible to exaggerate the evil of this age—but it certainly preponderated. Much of its life was brutal and hard. The coming of the Revival brought in a new philanthropy and tenderness.

This book, which deals specially with the background of the century, will give to us a fuller understanding of the work and triumphs of the Revival. Dr. Whiteley has written a book which will be indispensable to all students of the Revival.

THE CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS.

At the Faith and Order Conference in Edinburgh in August of last year one of the delegates was 'His Holiness Moran Mar Basilius Guvarghese II., Catholicos of the East.' He lives in Kottayam, Travancore, South India, and is the head of one of the rival sections that claim to be the true successors of the ancient 'Thomas Christians' of India. The tragic—and also heroic—record of this Church is told by the Rev. F. E. Keay in a useful volume called *The History of the Syrian Church in India* (S.P.C.K., Madras; 12 annas). The heroic aspect of the story can be conjectured from the fact that this little Church has lived on through many centuries in the midst of a hostile and heathen environment and maintained its witness, a flame never wholly quenched. And to-day the Syrian Christian is exercising a wide and increasing influence throughout the whole of India.

What this Church actually endured in the earlier centuries of its history cannot now be known.

No doubt the Christians of Malabar were more fortunate than those of Persia in being beyond the reach of the Muslim conqueror. The rule of the Hindu King of Cochin was milder than that of Tamerlane. Dr. Farquhar suggests that their steadfastness may have been greater because the truth they clung to reached back to an apostolic source. Dr. Keay, like Dr. Farquhar, and indeed like all of us, would like to believe that the old legend of their origin was well grounded. In any case it seems to be fairly certain that this Christian Church has existed in India for sixteen centuries.

The recent history of this Church, which is told in some detail by Dr. Keay, has been scarcely less chequered than its earlier history was. In judging of the contentions that have rent the Church so grievously in recent times we must take into account the great difficulty that arises from the fact that it is under the nominal control of the Patriarch of Antioch, who has only the most shadowy of relations with it and yet has power to make and unmake its spiritual leaders. The result is that there are said to be established at Kottayam a larger number of Bishops than anywhere else in Christendom. Many efforts have been made by such friends of the Church as the present Lord Halifax and the late Bishop Gore to heal the strife that has so weakened its spiritual influence and retarded its progress. The finest of its sons, notably a group educated in the Madras Christian College, deplore these internecine feuds and are doing all they can to bring them to an end and to create a new spirit of brotherhood and a new sense of the challenge that comes to them as Christian witnesses in a land with which they have ties so intimate and so ancient. Nor can Christians of a later date like ourselves refuse our sympathy and our help to these our elder brothers in Christ. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells us that in 883 King Alfred sent gifts 'to India to St. Thomas,' and those who read Dr. Keay's book may well be moved to do the same to-day. One aim of the book is to help on the cause of Church Union in South India and every one must agree with its author that a united Church with the Syrian Christians bringing their ancient tradition into it would be the most effective of all apostles to India of the Lord Jesus Christ.

MAN'S RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

In *The "Truth" of the Bible* (S.P.C.K.; 9s. net) Dr. Stanley A. Cook continues to develop and expand the line of thought adumbrated in 'The Old Testament: A Reinterpretation.' The earlier volume

was a statement of the writer's theory of religious history as a process which, though continuous, is yet marked by great epoch-making crises, each of which determines the course taken in the succeeding age. Thus in the new volume we have distinguished the first great period, going back to Abrahamic times, the second is the Mosaic (though Dr. Cook lays no stress on Abraham and Moses as historical personages), the third is inaugurated by Deutero-Isaiah, and the fourth is the Christian era—up-to-date. To-day, it seems, we stand on the threshold of a fifth age, and what form that will take no man yet can say. Within the various epochs there are other and lesser crises, for example, the rise of the eighth-century prophets in Israel, the Maccabean struggle, and the Reformation.

A superficial glance at the title may suggest that Dr. Cook is in doubt as to whether Truth is to be found in the Bible. He does well, therefore, to give an entirely satisfactory explanation of his use of the inverted commas. They are intended to make the reader ask himself what kind of truth he expects to find in the Bible (p. 204), in other words, what is its permanent value, and how that value may best be won and used. As a matter of fact, this is not so much a book about the Bible as a general study of human life, thought, and religion, in which the Bible plays a prominent part. The earlier chapters, it is true, contain some account of the message of Scripture, but these form a part of the introduction to the main theme, discussed especially in the last three chapters.

The reader cannot fail to be impressed by the breadth of vision, the wide area of learning, and the passion for truth, which Professor Cook manifests. We should expect from him an accurate knowledge of Palestinian archaeology and of the Bible, but we have here also an extensive acquaintance with comparative religion and a freedom in handling philosophical and scientific themes which make his work one of the most remarkable of recent books. He quotes freely from writers of all kinds, and it is interesting to note that he records a special debt of gratitude to the late A. B. Davidson. But he knows Karl Marx almost as well.

While the book is full of great sentences, thought-provoking and illuminating, it is not always easy to follow Dr. Cook's main line of thought. We shall not be far wrong, however, if we interpret his aim as the presentation of man's religious history, in the widest sense, in such a form as to indicate the nature of the present crisis. We do not get the impression that he is attempting to sketch the line which the new age will take, or to prescribe some

panacea which will set the world right; his aim is diagnosis rather than treatment. But underlying the whole we are conscious of the grandly optimistic conviction that man is on the verge of new and stupendous discoveries in the spiritual realm, which shall determine the course of human religion for untold centuries to come. It is significant that he ends with the Cross—'the symbol . . . which stands on a hill, apart . . . the assurance that it is not men alone whose concern is with the history and conditions of men, but that behind and above all is Divine Love.'

THE HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND.

There has been issued the third volume of Dr. W. K. Jordan's massive and learned work—*The Development of Religious Toleration in England* (Allen & Unwin; 21s. net). It covers the period from the Convention of the Long Parliament to the Restoration, 1640–1660. It is not in the least derogatory to the two previous volumes to say that this one is calculated to arouse keenest interest, for it covers a very sensational twenty years during which the foundations of civil and religious liberty were being laid not only in the Senate but in the Field, and Anglicans and Presbyterians were in turn dispossessed, while other denominations and sects were making their own contribution towards toleration. Dr. Jordan's work is one which deserves, and no doubt will keep, a permanent place in the literature of the subject. That there is widespread interest in the topic is proved by the number of books that have recently appeared dealing with it. None of these, however, is on anything like the scale to which Dr. Jordan is working, and we are sure that for long his volume will abide as the standard work of reference. His task, as he has conceived and worked it out, is laborious and exhaustive. Every important statement is carefully 'documented,' and the whole is impartial or scientific in temper.

We can only briefly indicate the contents. We have first the rise and collapse of Presbyterian Dominance; then the period of Independent Dominance; then two sections dealing with the relation to Toleration of Presbyterian and Independent and Baptist thought respectively.

Within the period under review the principles of Toleration with which we are to-day familiar were not seldom well stated, although the times were not then altogether ripe for their practice. Dr. Jordan does full justice to all, and reminds us how

excellently Cromwell formulated Toleration as the State policy, and how impressive was the demonstration that 'religious freedom offers no terrors to the godly.' 'Contrary to the gloomy predictions of the orthodox, England was not engulfed in heresy, nor was piety destroyed.'

A work like this is of more than merely academic interest. For we live in a time which sees liberty curtailed in many quarters; and a perusal of this volume and its predecessors will confirm our faith in freedom of thought and opinion.

UNITARIANISM AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

In his book on *The Unitarian Contribution to Social Progress in England* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net) Mr. Raymond V. Holt, M.A., B.Litt., Tutor and Librarian of Manchester College, Oxford, gives, it may be, an exaggerated impression of the influence of the Unitarian Movement on social progress in England; but undoubtedly that influence has been great. The exaggerated impression, if it is given, would be due not so much to what the author claims for the movement as to the method of his book. When one turns to his chapters on the Unitarian contribution to the industrial revolution, Parliamentary reform, the new social order, local government, and education, one discovers that these contain a good deal of useful general matter as well as matter strictly relevant to the theme which is being investigated. The general matter might quite well be presented apart from the specific Unitarian reference.

Besides the chapters above mentioned there are two chapters on the Unitarian movement, one on the creation of the Unitarian tradition, and the other on the structure of Unitarianism and nineteenth-century changes. They are informative chapters, such as could be supplied only by one who had access to the large body of Unitarian biographies and congregational histories. We see no reason why those chapters should not have come at the beginning rather than at the end of the work; and the advantage to the ordinary reader is fairly obvious.

It may be added that the word 'Unitarian' is used in this book in a comprehensive sense, but that it is applied particularly 'to those members of English dissenting congregations who developed heretical views about the middle of the eighteenth century' and 'to members of those congregations founded later which were Unitarian from the outset.' The oldest Unitarian congregations, it should perhaps be observed, grew out of Puritan congregations of the seventeenth century.

ENGLAND: BEFORE AND AFTER
WESLEY.

Dr. J. Wesley Bready in his book, *England: Before and After Wesley* (Hodder & Stoughton; ros. 6d. net), gives us a picture of the life of England in the days before and after the coming of Wesley and the Evangelical Revival. He says, 'Look on this picture, and on that.' He shows the difference between the one period and the other—pointing out the grim brutality, the low ideals, the profanity, the materialism of the pre-Wesley days, and showing that in the Wesley and post-Wesley period much of the brutality and materialism passed away, and that a new temper and climate came into the life of the nation. He seeks to show, and gives much evidence, that the change was brought by the Evangelical Revival. It is obvious that, in the realm of spiritual religion, the Wesleys and their followers led many of the people of England out of the wilderness into the promised land. Dr. Bready, however, insists that their influence was much wider. He realizes that the passion and pity of the Evangelical Revival broke the frost, and made warm streams to flow in many departments of English life, transforming the social and economic conditions to a greater degree than many historians have realized.

We believe that Dr. Bready is correct in this judgment. He rightly says, 'The current modern notion that the Evangelical Revival was ridiculously individualistic and morbidly "other-worldly" is completely false.' There is, at times, as Dr. Bready points out, more than a trace of the conservative in John Wesley—but, remembering this, he does well to recall the words of Canon Overton: 'John Wesley was the most revolutionary Tory who ever lived.' He had no sympathy with solitary religion. He instilled his followers with ideas of social religion. We agree with Dr. Bready's saying, 'Two maxims of Wesley were indelibly impressed upon all true Evangelical tradition: (1) "The Gospel of Christ knows of no religion but social, no holiness but social holiness," (2) "I look upon the world as my parish."' The social and missionary activities of Wesley reveal how true he was to his own teaching. Dr. Bready shows clearly that, through the influence and spirit of the Revival, hospitals were built, the slave-trade was stopped, the slaves were freed, child-labour was abolished, factory legislation was introduced. At times, in anxiety to establish his thesis, he seems to overlook other influences—not Evangelical—which made their contribution. Dr. Bready has

given to us a most valuable book. We hope and believe that it will have a wide circulation.

JUDAICA.

The *Hebrew Union College Annual*, xii.-xiii. (1937-38) (Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati) is, as we have learnt to expect, a rich mine of information for the study of Judaism in all its aspects. Biblical studies, for instance, are represented by two or three articles. The chief of these is the continuation of Morgenstern's work on Amos; the new instalment deals especially with the date of his prophecies, and identifies the 'earthquake' as that mentioned by Josephus as occurring in the reign of Uzziah. Israel Eitan offers some interesting notes, (not all of them new) on the text and interpretation of Isaiah. Traditions regarding Biblical characters appear in Sheldon H. Blank's discussion of the Death of Zechariah, and in an article by Joshua Finkel on an Arabic story of Abraham. The volume is particularly rich in philological studies. The most interesting is an ambitious and brilliant attempt by Alexander Sperber to reconstruct the grammar of the Hebrew language from Greek and Latin transliterations, especially, of course, from Origen, and so to reach a stage earlier than that represented by Massoretic tradition. Other philological material is supplied by Julius Lewy, Joseph Reider, and Henry Engländer. There is an acute study of the Mishnah text in Babylonia by Kahle, and Rabbinic Literature is further represented in Jacob Mann's publication of an early theologico-polemical work, directed against Jewish heretics and others, and a fragment of a new Midrash on Deuteronomy. In both cases the Hebrew text is printed *in extenso*. There is an interesting account (in modern Hebrew) of the Jewish synagogues of Alexandria, and Jehudah Fries-Horen gives some suggestions and corrections on the text of a famous commentary. Mediæval Judaism is represented by the study of a detail in the life of Maimonides, and by a comparison between the fasts of Judaism and those of Islam. There is also an additional list of mediæval Hebrew poetry by Israel Davidson. To the modern period belong Israel Bettan's study of the sermons of Isaac Arama, Cecil Roth's additions to an earlier article on 'Revolutionary Purims,' and the chief editor's account of the correspondence between Max Lilienthal and S. D. Luzzato. The volume as a whole is rich and varied, with an appeal to all types of mind interested in Judaism, ancient or modern.

Two years ago the Chief Rabbi completed his

edition of the Pentateuch with the publication of the volume on Deuteronomy. Dr. Hertz has now re-issued the whole of his work in a single volume—*The Pentateuch and Haftorahs*, Hebrew Text, English Translation and Commentary (Soncino Press; 8s. 6d. net). The new edition has the Hebrew and English texts side by side on the same page, with the notes in two columns at the foot of the page. The format is somewhat larger than that of the separate volumes, and the type is smaller, but still clear and easy to read, both in English and in Hebrew. Those who have found Dr. Hertz's notes to be of value will appreciate the appearance of this handy and well-produced form of his work.

The Chief Rabbi celebrates his silver jubilee this year, and the publication just mentioned may be in a sense a memorial volume. Certainly we may look on another work of his in that light. This is a collection of *Sermons, Addresses and Studies* in three volumes (Soncino Press; 21s. net). We have here an expression of opinion on a large variety of subjects. The sermons, for instance, are of different types; some deal with special festivals, some are concerned with great crises in the life of the Jewish people and of the world in general. Among the most attractive are the memorial sermons; naturally Dr. Hertz has had something to say of every great British Jew who has passed away during the last twenty-five years. Many of the addresses were delivered on special occasions, as at the opening of conferences called to consider some aspect of Jewish life and faith. One particularly interesting group is connected with the Chief Rabbi's tour of the British Dominions in 1920-21. The 'Studies' are mainly theological, and the majority of them are 'additional notes' reprinted from the Commentary on the Pentateuch. From the whole we get an interesting picture of a striking personality. We see Dr. Hertz as a scholar without pedantry, who knows how to bring his learning within the reach of the ordinary man, as a controversialist who is prepared to defend Jewish nationality and faith against all attacks, as a pastor with a deep concern for the spiritual life of the people entrusted to him, and as a man capable of tender and lasting friendship. Through the whole there runs a vein of genuine and sometimes delicate humour, which comes to the front whenever the subject is not too serious or tragic to permit it.

tions, the Gothic cathedrals; with their privileges and charters, their vast confluence of students from the farthestmost regions of the Western World; their inordinate dignity and fierce-held democracy, their turbulent, hard-drinking, riotous students; their bloody affrays, strikes, and secessions; and withal, their good hard learning and their soaring philosophies.' With these words Nathan Schachner introduces his account of *The Mediæval Universities* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), and the story which follows is one which holds the attention of the reader to the last page. The popular picture of the Middle Ages as a period of passive submission to the Church, of unity in belief and practice, a picture which every student of history knows to be a fiction, is here illuminated with a weird variety of sidelights. We hear of professors being fined by their students for being absent or late, of statutes 'forbidding the Dean and Vice-Chancellor to give candidates private information of the questions in the coming examination,' of reluctant Rectors compelled to accept office, compelled also to redeem at exorbitant price every shred of clothing torn from off their back.

The universities to which the writer has devoted most attention are Paris, Bologna, and Oxford, but a general survey is given of the others. Many great and interesting personages come into view, from Abelard and Aquinas to Wycliffe and John Hus. The author traces the rise of the great European universities from the Cathedral Schools of the tenth and eleventh centuries, and their gradual development into republics of learning with power to treat on terms of equality with king and pope. He describes the great conflict between Realism and Nominalism, and the emergence of Scholasticism as the ancient wisdom made safe for Rome. It is a historical work of excellence, written in a pungent style, and with a salt of humour which should make it in the best sense popular.

We are glad to have in English the most considerable and illuminative of the late President T. G. Masaryk's philosophical writings—*Modern Man and Religion* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It was the Great War and the subsequent years that made the name of Masaryk familiar throughout the world. His disinterested labours for his own small country in its difficult situation were well known and appreciated. Too few, however, realized that he was a man of thought no less than a man of action. At first this work seems to be antiquated. It was written some forty years ago; and in philosophy much water has flowed under

'A fascinating story, as authentically indigenous to the mediæval scene as that of their sister aspira-

the bridges since then. In politics, economics, and science tremendous changes have been witnessed. Yet perusal of the book will reveal that Masaryk has a message as vital to our own day as to his own prime. His main contention just is that without religion society will crumble and tumble into chaos; and surely the years have only added fresh testimony to the truth of that. He reviews the philosophical teachings of Hume, Kant, Comte, Spencer, and the Czech Smetana, showing how each of them is compelled to have recourse to religion or something akin to religion. Then turning to literature and examining Goethe and de Musset, he points to the ill consequences of revolt against God. The last part of the book is obviously only a sketch which the author had no opportunity to fill in and complete; but the whole is a book worth having and worth reading.

Democratic Leadership, by Principal A. Barratt Brown, M.A. (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net), is the Swarthmore Lecture for 1938. The writer is a firm believer in democracy and democratic leadership, but he seeks a more firm grasp of its principles and a more thorough application of them in practice. He finds in the constitution and proceedings of the Quaker Meeting a model of the kind of thing to be aimed at. There you have, not merely a counting of heads, and decision by a majority, but the putting of heads together in a friendly conference which aims at finding 'the sense of the meeting.' This method, which leaves no room for a triumphant majority and an embittered minority, is, in the writer's belief, the wise, right, and Christian way of democracy, and individuals, parties and nations should be educated and encouraged to follow it.

Duty and the Will of God, by the Rev. L. A. Garrard, B.D. (Blackwell; 12s. 6d. net), proves on reading to be, to a greater extent than the title would indicate, a history of Christian ethics, for to this the main part of the book is devoted. In the first and shorter section the writer examines the nature of the idea of duty with special reference to Kant's categorical imperative. He finds that 'our duty is always to set ourselves to do the act that we believe would have the effect of satisfying the greatest claim upon us.' Further analysis gives 'as an alternative statement of our categorical imperative the principle that we ought always to do the will of God.' The bulk of the book is devoted to a study of 'duty in Christian theology,' and a most valuable and illuminating study it is. A careful and scholarly review is

given of the ethics of Jesus, preceded by a treatment of 'the Jewish conception of duty,' and followed by chapters on the contribution of St. Paul and the later New Testament writings. Thereafter the great Christian thinkers are discussed—Augustine, Aquinas, the Reformers, etc.—in so far as they treat of duty, and such special topics are dealt with as the double standard and the doctrine of conscience. Part III. of the book reviews 'the moral situation in Christian theology,' especially the doctrine of the Law of Nature in its relation to human institutions such as slavery, property, and government. The whole is a very thoughtful and valuable treatise, giving evidence on every page of wide reading, deep and incisive thinking, and sound judgment.

The Rev. Frank H. Ballard, M.A., in *The Return to Religion* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net; and in paper covers, 1s. 6d. net), sets out from the Archbishop's call to the nation and deals in a popular fashion with the essentials. In the first part of the book he writes under the heading 'The Recall to Religion' and surveys successively *The Return to God*, *The Return to a Christian Conception of Man*, *The Return to a Christian Way of Life*, and *The Return to the Priesthood of all Believers*. The second part of the book was incited by Mr. H. G. Wells's rather silly remarks about the Bible at a recent conference, and considers *The Bible as Literature*, *The People's Book*, *The Text Book of Human Liberty*, and *The Holy Book*. These chapters were originally delivered as sermons and retain the homiletic form. But they are well worthy of a more permanent form. They are thoughtful, earnest, and persuasive presentations of urgent truth.

An earnest and intelligent attempt to deal with the condition of the unemployed in one of the 'Special Areas' has been made by the Rev. Kent White and a band of devoted helpers. A full and interesting account of the experiment is given in *The Hostel of the Good Shepherd* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net). The book has for its aim an effort to remind complacent people of the terrible abuses that exist, in the hope that some possibilities of useful action may be suggested by Mr. White's experience. In successive chapters he tells the story of how a centre of activity, or rather activities, was established, and various attractive social and religious and even material enterprises were organized. The little book is important because of the originality and practical nature of the

measures devised. There are both inspiration and guidance in these pages.

A series of addresses which the Rev. J. R. Ackroyd, B.D., delivered in Worthing Congregational Church have been published under the title *Christ Speaks to our Generation* (Independent Press; 1s. net). In five chapters we have Christ's message to the individual, the community, the Church, the nation, and the world. All are suggestive and pointed, and we are not surprised to read in the Rev. W. M. Girdwood's 'Introduction' that they were found impressive and a means of blessing.

A little book on *The Lord's Prayer*, by Mr. V. D. Davis, B.A. (Lindsey Press; 1s. net), is welcome. It contains an interpretation of the prayer, clause by clause, and also an address on 'The Offering of Prayer.' As the Lord's Prayer is repeated every Sunday by all of us, contains a summary of Christ's teaching, and is often misunderstood, or not understood at all, books of this kind have a clear usefulness.

The Rt. Rev. A. F. Winnington-Ingram, D.D., Bishop of London, has written a short book entitled *What a Layman Should Believe* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). It is an appreciation and criticism of the recent Report on Doctrine in the Church of England. The 'appreciation' takes the form of an exposition, simple, clear, and untechnical, and enforced by many an illustrative instance, of certain fundamental Christian conceptions and affirmations. The 'criticism' is chiefly directed against the 'liberal' positions to which some of the signatories to the Report declared themselves to adhere; in particular, the denial of the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection of Jesus. Dr. Ingram states the case for the conservative view on these doctrines, and is not slow to point out that the Archbishop of York among the signatories is on his side. It is a very readable book he gives us, and many will find it helpful.

The Rev. J. A. Broadbelt has followed up his book on 'Full Salvation' by a series of addresses published under the title of *The Burning Heart* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 1s. 6d. net). These addresses have the true Wesleyan ring about them, being full of fervour and striking the note of joy and victory. Some of them have already appeared in 'Joyful News,' and they will doubtless be welcomed by a wider circle of readers.

In his book, *The Stolen Sword* (Methuen; 6s. net), Principal L. P. Jacks makes what might at first sight seem to be merely an excursus into the region of detective fiction, and tells a thrilling story of a famous sword, with almost magical properties, said to have been originally used at the battle of Agincourt. It is a perilous possession, and the struggle to retain it, against the machinations of accomplished gangsters, provide many exciting incidents. The ultimate possessor regards the sword as a sacred hereditary trust, and so arranges matters that, after his death, no other human being shall acquire it. By reading between the lines of this tale an allegory might be discovered, hinting at the disastrous benefit of the possession of armaments; and the frequently repeated sentence, 'We are not pursuing a policy; we are keeping a promise,' would suggest the doctrine that militarism in all its phases is traditional rather than rational.

The Lamp of Epictetus, by Mr. Edward Jacomb (Methuen; 10s. 6d. net), does not profess to be a translation, but rather a paraphrase. Being convinced that a literal translation from the Greek would be dull and uninteresting to the modern reader, the author says, 'I have attempted to express Epictetus's thoughts as he might have expressed them were he lecturing in English to a class of young Englishmen at the present day; and I have deliberately used anachronisms, slang, and even Americanisms, when such seemed likely to beget a vividness which would otherwise be lacking.' There are obvious dangers in this method, but of the 'vividness' there can be no doubt. Take this example of 'advice to a boy on leaving school.' 'Well, my dear boy, here you are just going into the world for the first time. What an adventure! Now we want you to do something for us—to be, in fact, a kind of scout for us; to go out and see everything, and then come back and make a report. It won't be an easy job, you know. You'll want all your pluck to carry it through. But you won't be daunted by difficulties, will you? Difficulties prove the man.' The book will be found eminently readable and may do something to recommend Epictetus to modern readers. At the same time many will be apt to feel that the lectures, while containing good things, have a discouraging sameness about them, and that the argumentation is at times a somewhat barren logomachy. In the Stoic doctrine also, with its contempt for natural affection and all earthly comfort, there is a tone which we cannot but judge to be hard and affected.

In 1847 there landed in Bombay a young American missionary of the name of George Bowen. After a somewhat dilettante and adventurous youth he had been profoundly moved and changed in heart by a passionate love for a young lady whose memory, after her early death, he cherished to the end of his life. Devoting himself to mission work he felt impelled to accept no salary and to dedicate himself to a life of poverty. For forty years he lived in a little hut in the bazaar, sustaining his frail little body (he weighed only a hundred pounds) on native food and preaching daily in the streets of Bombay. Without being able to name a single convert he was revered by all as a Christian saint and a devotional writer of depth and insight. His memoir is at long length published under the title of *George Bowen of Bombay*, by Mr. Robert E. Speer (Missionary Review of the World, New York; \$2.50). The get-up of the volume is not attractive. The page is crowded and is mainly occupied with extracts from letters and diaries in distressingly small print. But the patient reader with good eyesight will find here many spiritual gems.

A little book which should prove of great use to Sunday-school teachers has been issued by the National Sunday School Union, entitled *Twenty-Five Festival Orders of Service*, by Miss Bertha C. Krall (9d. net). It covers all types of special services. Besides the festivals of the Christian Year we have orders of service for harvest, flowers, cradle roll, promotion, teachers' re-dedication, etc. Full directions for each service are given, and the variety of suggestions offered shows that a great deal of thought and ingenuity has gone to the making up of this little book. It deserves a warm welcome.

Dr. Campbell Morgan seems to rival Spurgeon himself in the fertility of his Scriptural exposition. In the *Voices of Twelve Hebrew Prophets* (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d. net) he deals with the so-called Minor Prophets, setting forth the spiritual message of each. Critical questions do not interest him. He merely mentions in passing, for example, that he does not doubt the historic accuracy of the story of Jonah. His aim throughout is to find in each case the divine word which the prophet was commissioned to deliver. After all, this is the thing that most matters, and preachers who intend to lecture on the Minor Prophets will find here much that is suggestive and helpful.

The Rev. Cyril Charles Richardson, B.A., S.T.M., Th.D., assistant Professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary, has given us a good book in *The Church Through the Centuries* (Scribners; 8s. 6d. net). It is a history not of the Church but of the conception of the Church. In the frequent conferences as to the possibility of Christian reunion, the question 'What is the Church?' is of basal importance. Opinions have differed and do differ so much. Dr. Richardson in a series of well-informed and well-written chapters sets before us the main types of conception from the days of the apostles to our own; and endeavours to describe the historical background of each view. Thus we have accounts of the Church-conceptions of the early centuries, the age of Augustine, the Middle Ages, the Reformation Period, and the Modern Period. It is all very interesting, informative, and suggestive. The conclusion is that 'we understand the meaning of the Church as the divine creation, the body of those whom God has called through His Son, and sent into the world to do His will. Because the truth of the Christian tradition is vital and not dead, it is embodied in a living community, which preserves, re-interprets, and hands it down to successive generations. In the Church Christianity is made alive.'

It is not generally realized that the Bible consists for the most part of traditions that were *spoken*, not written. Paul's letters were dictated and bear all the marks of this. The historical parts of the Old Testament were composed of stories originally recited round the camp fire. The prophetic works were uttered, not, in the first place at any rate, written. And to get the full value of the Bible it should be read aloud. This is part of the value of the Lessons in church. And therefore a book like *How to Read the Bible Aloud*, by the Rev. R. S. T. Haslehurst, B.D., Priest-Vicar of Chichester Cathedral (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net), is calculated to be of great service. One wondered how a whole book could be made on such a subject, but Mr. Haslehurst has no difficulty about that. He deals faithfully with the faults of clerical public speech, with the essentials of good reading, with voice production, with 'theatrical' and 'dramatic' reading, with wrong emphasis, with reading public prayers. It is all good, and all, alas! necessary. And the book ought to be read by all who propose to read the Bible aloud in public.

Recently many books have appeared containing prayers for young people, not all of them good.

A Service Book for Youth (S.P.C.K.; school edition 1s. 6d. net, teachers' edition 3s. 6d. net) is, however, different. It contains thirty-two complete services for school prayers, one page to each service. The plan is to begin with a psalm verse, then a reading, then a brief prayer, followed by a very short litany, a silent prayer and the Lord's Prayer. At the end of the book are supplementary readings from many sources—Marcus Aurelius, Faber, William Penn, St. Francis, the Gospels, and others. There is a sensible introduction on the conduct of school prayers. This is a book of great charm and value. It is also beautifully dressed and printed. No author or compiler is named, but the Archbishop of York writes a well-deserved commendatory foreword.

Jesus and the Common Man To-day, by the Rev. W. J. Wray, M.A. (Stockwell; 2s. 6d. net), is a vigorous and heartsome book. It deals in a dozen chapters with such topics as the Resources of Jesus, the Inspiration Jesus brings, Jesus and Youth, Jesus and Anxious Souls, Jesus Lord of Death. The writer appeals throughout for steadfast faith in Christ and for wholehearted devotion to His cause. Each chapter is concluded with an appropriate prayer.

Five Minutes to Twelve, by the Rev. Adolf Keller, D.D., LL.D. (S.C.M.; 2s. net), is the arresting title of a little book which intends to give 'a spiritual interpretation of the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences.' None of the delegates to these oecumenical councils could have had a more profound insight into the religious and political state of Europe than Dr. Keller, and few may have had his intense spirituality. His reflections on the proceedings and his reaction to the whole situation make a contribution of quite peculiar value. Above all else he was impressed, on the one hand

by the consciousness of unity in Christ in spite of theological differences, and on the other hand by the desperate need of the world which the gospel alone can meet. 'It is five minutes to twelve on the world's political dial! . . . This should not be a "scare-head" phrase, but a challenge to the Church of Christ to use what may be its last opportunity.'

The Rev. D. T. Niles, B.D., a young Christian leader of Ceylon, has written a very striking little book—*Sir, We Would See Jesus* (S.C.M.; 2s. net). It is, as the sub-title indicates, a study in evangelism. Its chapters deal with the plea for evangelism, its rationale, its practice, the evangelizing church, the indigenous church, and there is an appendix on methods and the special problem of the depressed classes. It is all very fresh and cheering and highly instructive. No missionary study circle should miss it, nor any individual who desires to know what Christianity is making of cultured Easterns, and what they are making of it.

Dr. Cyril H. Valentine, who recently gave us a most useful book on 'The Treatment of Moral and Emotional Difficulties,' has followed this up by an equally practical, if slighter, volume on *Psychology and Modern Life* (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net). The title is too large for the subject, which is really very much the same as that of his previous book. But this little volume is in its own way equally useful. It contains four addresses given as a course of lunch-hour talks at the Church of St. Edmund the King, Lombard Street, London. The audience consisted of busy city workers, and naturally Dr. Valentine was colloquial in his manner of speech. This does not lessen, but rather increases, the attractiveness of the talks. These deal with common neurotic weaknesses, and might well have been given from a pulpit. At any rate they may well suggest subjects for excellent practical discourses.

The Early Church and Pacifism.

BY THE REVEREND J. S. MACARTHUR, B.D., M.A., ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE, LLANDAFF.

GENERALLY speaking, pre-Christian ethics did not regard war as evil in itself. This may be in large measure accounted for by the fact that each state was thought of as a universe in itself with its own religion and laws, the rights of other states hardly being considered at all, so that a system of international ethics scarcely came within the scope of the philosopher. It is true that Plato got beyond this idea to a certain extent and regarded civil wars, *i.e.*, wars between one Greek state and another, with horror as being fratricidal, but wars between Greeks and barbarians were regarded as inevitable, and there is little hint of the *inevitable* being modified by *unfortunately*.

With the advent of Christianity, however, a change was to be expected, since Christianity professed a universality to which no other religion had previously laid claim. Christ had died for the salvation of all men. Hence the adoption of Christianity seemed to involve the extension of principles previously binding the individual members of one state to the relations between state and state. All Christians were brothers, and so, if all the world were Christian, all wars would be fratricidal. And even though the whole world were not yet Christian it became questionable whether Christians had any right to kill those who, if not yet fellow-Christians, were at least fellow-men and potential fellow-Christians. This was the view of Tertullian who went the length of saying that there was nothing more entirely foreign to Christians than the affairs of State, for they acknowledged one all-embracing commonwealth—the world.¹

In the Apostolic Age the question of the Christian attitude towards war seems scarcely to have arisen. The end of the world was thought to be imminent. Wars and rumours of wars were to be the precursors of the great cataclysm. They were not regarded as permanent factors in a future demanding the definition of an appropriate Christian attitude to them. Detachment from the question of war was at first rendered easier for the Church by the fact that in the Roman Empire at that time there was nothing like universal military conscription, and that in any case Jews, with whom Christians were in early times assimilated, were exempt from military service. Yet during this

period we have to note one interesting incident. In the Jewish War of A.D. 66–70 the Christian community in Jerusalem in obedience to a vision left the city before it was besieged and settled at Pella in Peraea, thus taking no part in the war against Rome.² More than one reason for this action might be conjectured, but one possible explanation is that the Jerusalem Christians believed that the use of the sword was forbidden to them.

But if the advent of Christianity logically involved the supersession of Graeco-Roman ethics about war, how far did it involve the modification of the Old Testament view? The Old Testament was accepted by the Church, and it contained records of wars without condemnation of those who took part in them. It cannot be said that the Church regarded this as justifying wars in the age of the New Covenant, but it is probable that her veneration for the Old Testament hindered her total rejection of war, and the same may be said of the Messianic warfare recorded in the Apocalypse.³

It was towards the close of the second century that the problem of war began seriously to concern the Church. By that time the eschatological hope had waned. It could not be said either of the world or of the Roman Empire that the end was in sight. The faith was spreading and was finding recruits in all ranks and classes of society, including the army. Towards the end of this period we find Tertullian making his triumphant assertion:

'We are but of yesterday, and we have filled every place among you—cities, islands, fortresses, towns, market-places, the very camp.'⁴

In an earlier passage of the same treatise (c. 5) he alleges the testimony of Marcus Aurelius to the effect that relief from drought had been obtained by the prayers of Christians fighting in the imperial army. Yet it would be wrong to conclude that Tertullian regarded with approval the presence of Christians in the Roman army, for it is in his writings that we have some of the strongest assertions of pacifist opinion to be found in the Early Church. The suggestion has been made that while he was a Catholic he could write accepting the service of Christians in the army, as in the

² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, III. v. 3.

³ Harnack, *Militia Christi*, II f.

⁴ *Apologeticus*, 37.

¹ *Apologeticus*, 38.

passage just quoted, but that when he became a Montanist his pacifist views hardened. In favour of this suggestion is the generally acknowledged late date of his *De Corona*, a work dealing expressly with the question of military service, but against it is the disagreement among scholars regarding the date of the *De Idololatria* in which one of his most uncompromising declarations of the pacifist position occurs.

The *De Corona* is concerned with the case of a soldier who refused to wear the military chaplet on a ceremonial occasion. On being challenged for his reason he declared that he had no liberty to wear the chaplet with the rest as he was a Christian. He was taken before the prefects and proceeded to discard his military uniform, giving up his sword 'which was not necessary either for the protection of our Lord.' Thence he was taken to prison to await 'the largess of Christ.' His action was criticized as a headstrong courting of martyrdom and as likely to cause trouble for his fellow-Christians in the army. Tertullian defends the soldier at great length, pointing out the associations of the military chaplet with pagan worship and the concessions to paganism involved in wearing it. After a good deal of rather pedantic reasoning about the significance of the chaplet he asks (c. 11) whether warfare is proper at all for Christians, and whether there is any sense in discussing the merely accidental when that on which it rests is to be condemned. Why, then, is warfare to be condemned? Even here the objections are not purely pacifist but are connected with the concessions to the pagan cultus involved in military service. Thus Tertullian asks whether it is lawful for a human oath to be superadded to one that is divine, and for a man to come under promise to another master after Christ. The force of this will be better appreciated if we remember that divine honours were paid to the emperor. Then comes the genuinely pacifist objection—can it be held lawful to make an occupation of the sword, when the Lord proclaims that he who uses the sword shall perish by the sword? Shall the son of peace take part in battle when it does not become him even to sue at law? Shall he apply the chain, and the prison, and the torture, and the punishment, who is not the avenger of his own wrongs?

So far he has been considering the choice of the military life as an occupation, and he seems to be in no doubt that a Christian who chose it would be doing wrong. But what of those who become Christians while serving in the army? Must they abandon military service? Tertullian

admits that with them the case is different, and cites the instances of the soldiers who approached John the Baptist and were not refused, the centurion of whom Christ approved, and the centurion whom Peter instructed. With these Scriptural examples before him Tertullian cannot say that the soldier when he becomes a Christian is bound to throw away his arms, but we feel that that is what he would have liked to say, for the concession that the case is different does not amount to very much. He says that three choices lie before the soldier who becomes a Christian. He may abandon military service at once as many have done. Or else the Christian soldier may resort to unworthy subterfuges in order to avoid offending God (the allusion seems to be to the difficulty of avoiding participation in pagan worship). Or, lastly, 'for God the fate must be endured which a citizen-faith has been no less ready to accept.'

It is significant that the strongest declaration of pacifism to be found in Tertullian occurs in a treatise against idolatry where he says: ¹—

'But now inquiry is made about this point, whether a believer may turn himself unto military service, and whether the military may be admitted unto the faith, even the rank and file, or each inferior grade, to whom there is no necessity for taking part in sacrifices or capital punishment. There is no agreement between the divine and the human sacrament,² the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil, the camp of light and the camp of darkness. One soul cannot be due to two [lords]—God and Caesar. And yet Moses carried a rod, and Aaron wore a buckle, and John (Baptist) is girt with leather, and Joshua the son of Nun leads a line of march; and the People warred: if it pleases you to sport with the subject. But how will [a Christian man] war, nay, how will he serve even in peace, without a sword, which the Lord has taken away? For albeit soldiers had come unto John, and had received the formula of their rule; albeit, likewise, a centurion had believed; [still] the Lord afterward, in disarming Peter, unbelted every soldier. No dress is lawful among us, if assigned to any unlawful action.'

This affords evidence in support of the suggestion already noted that veneration for the

¹ *De Idololatria*, 19.

² The reference here is to the *sacramentum* or military oath of loyalty. It has been suggested that the circumstance that the same word was used in Latin both for the soldier's oath and for the Christian sacraments tended to prevent the Church as a whole from taking up a thorough-going pacifist position.

Old Testament made the Church hesitate to adopt absolute pacifism. But how much weight did Tertullian's arguments carry with the majority of Christians? Gibbon, referring to the *De Corona* passage, says that his suggestion of the expedient of deserting was not very proper to conciliate the favour of the emperor towards the Christian sect. That may well be true, and there were those who blamed the spread of Christianity for weakening the military spirit of the Roman Empire.

Typical of the kind of anti-imperialist pacifism on which such a charge might be based is the following passage from the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix (xxv. 4):—'Thus, whatever the Romans hold, cultivate, or possess, is the spoil won by their insulence: all their temples are made from the spoils of war, that is, from the ruin of cities, the plundering of gods, and the murder of priests. That is insult and mockery, to yield obedience to conquered divinities and, after conquering them, to worship them in their captivity. For to worship that which you have taken with your own hand is to show reverence for sacrilege, not for gods. Therefore, as often as the Romans triumphed, so often did they commit sacrilege.'

Nevertheless there is not much evidence beyond Tertullian's own statement that Christians deserted from the army in large numbers. In the cases where trouble arose the problem of conscience seems more often to have been concerned with the risk of making concessions to idolatry than with the objection to shedding blood. The question of the lawfulness for a Christian of serving in the Roman army seems to have been for most Christians theoretically separable from the more general one of the lawfulness for a Christian of bearing arms at all. For Tertullian it was not thus separable, though it may be noted that many of his arguments are more relevant to the particular question than to the general one.

M. E. Vacandard has collected a number of historical examples referring to this point.¹ One of the most instructive of these is that of Marinus, an officer serving in Palestine about 260. The fact that he was an officer shows that not all Christian soldiers were content with serving in the ranks of the army where the likelihood of having to take part in pagan worship was less. Marinus had obtained promotion by seniority, but a fellow-officer who was jealous denounced him to the authorities as being a Christian and therefore refusing to sacrifice to the emperors. Therefore

according to the ancient laws there could be no high office for him in the army. Marinus, on being summoned before the tribunal, admitted that he was a Christian. He was given three hours in which to reflect on the consequences of his decision. The bishop of the place, Theotecnus, hearing how things stood, took Marinus into church, and placing the Gospels and the soldier's sword side by side said, 'Choose.' Without hesitation Marinus laid his hand on the Gospels, and at the end of the three hours was put to death.²

Vacandard rightly observes that but for the denunciation of his jealous rival Marinus would have pursued his military career. He must have been able somehow to reconcile the obligations of the service with the scruples of his conscience, and in Vacandard's opinion there is every reason to believe that there was a tacit understanding between Church and State to allow Christian soldiers to fulfil their office without compromising their consciences.

Towards the end of the third century the persecution under Galerius and Diocletian revealed the presence of Christians in the army. If the State had previously winked at the non-participation of Christian soldiers in pagan rites, it was no longer willing to turn a blind eye, and soldiers in Diocletian's army were ordered to sacrifice on pain of dismissal.³

But with the conversion of Constantine the persecutions of the Church were to come to an end. How was the attitude of Christians towards military service affected? Tertullian had said that if Caesar became a Christian he would no longer be Caesar, but when Constantine became a Christian nothing was farther from his mind than to give up being emperor. Consideration of the military successes of some of his pro-Christian predecessors is thought to have counted for something in Constantine's adoption of Christianity, and the most generally accepted story of his conversion connects it with a night vision in which he was promised victory in battle under the sign of the Cross. Whatever may have been the sincerity of his motives the desire to acquire a powerful supernatural ally in the furtherance of his military and political aims probably weighed a good deal with him.

Under Constantine and his successors the Church for the most part found it possible to countenance what she was pleased to term just wars. Now that the Roman Empire had become Christian, and

¹ *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse*, 2e série, 127 ff.

² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vii. 15.

³ Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, 10.

since it was against pagans and heretics that most of its wars were waged, little difficulty was experienced in justifying them. If for barbarians we substitute pagans and heretics, and for Greece the Roman Empire, we have a remarkably close analogy between the Platonic view of war and that of Christian Rome in the fourth century. Christianity was certainly a universal religion, but the Roman Empire so nearly included all civilization that its citizens were tempted, even though they were Christians, to regard Rome as the universe, and to look on her enemies as the enemies of God and humanity. Although there might be some hesitation about spreading the gospel by means of the sword, yet when Rome went to war her Christian subjects flocked loyally to her standards. Common honesty seemed to demand that some return should be made to the State for the benefits that the Church enjoyed at its hands.

But had the Church any right to make a payment of this sort? If, as Tertullian had claimed, Christ had sheathed the swords of His followers, could they possibly be justified in drawing them again at the bidding of the State? Was the abandonment of pacifism one of the concessions made to human imperfection by Christianity when it became the State religion? The Church ought not, it may be argued, to have accepted State patronage so easily; she should have made no compromise when Constantine sought admission to her ranks. As Peter sheathed his sword at the bidding of Christ, so ought Constantine to have sheathed his at the bidding of Christ's ambassadors. In the event of his refusal would it not have been better for Christians to remain a persecuted minority with their divine patrimony intact?

But in spite of such pacifist utterances as those of Tertullian it is more than doubtful whether the Church did regard pacifism as part of her divine inheritance. The main objection to military service does not seem to have been the pacifist one, but the obligation to participate in pagan worship, which service in the Roman army, at least in its higher ranks, involved. With the conversion of Constantine such obligation was abolished, and we find the emperor reinstating Christian officers whom his predecessors had deprived of their military rank on account of their Christianity.

The Church has indeed been thought to have gone the length not only of renouncing but of actually denouncing pacifism. Evidence for this is adduced from the third canon of the Council of Arles held in 314, which appeared to enact that those who throw away their arms in time of peace

are to be repelled from Communion.¹ But there are difficulties in this apparently obvious interpretation. What is the meaning of *in pace*? One suggestion is that as deserters in time of war would be punished by the military authorities the Church would be relieved of responsibility in dealing with them. Another interpretation is that *in pace* refers to the recently established peace between Church and State, and that the canon is in effect one of the terms of the concordat. Against both these interpretations is the lack of evidence for the application of such a rule and even the existence of evidence that precisely such action as these interpretations condemn was taken without incurring ecclesiastical censure. Dr. C. J. Cadoux² thinks that the canon does not refer to desertion from the army at all but is a prohibition of participation in the gladiatorial games. The phrase *qui arma projiciunt in pace* should then be translated not *those who throw away their arms in time of peace*, but *those who discharge weapons in time of peace* (i.e., when there is no need to use weapons, thus implying the legitimacy of military service but making no pronouncement about desertion). The probability of this interpretation is strengthened by the fact that the following canon deals with charioteers and actors.

What traces of pacifism are to be found in the Church after the conversion of Constantine? The twelfth canon of the Council of Nicaea orders that 'as many as had been called by grace, and had at first displayed their zeal, but who, having cast aside their military girdles, afterwards returned, like dogs, to their own vomit (so that some spent money and by means of gifts regained their military stations)' were to be subjected to a penance of thirteen years' duration, but Vacandard points out³ that this refers only to soldiers who had been deprived of their rank on account of their Christianity, but who had betrayed their faith by resuming service under Licinius, their action being tantamount to apostasy.

More definite indications of pacifism are to be found in various Church-Orders dealing with conditions of church membership and dating from the fourth century. The general attitude of these Church-Orders is not one of total condemnation of the military life for Christians, that is, if a soldier becomes a Christian he is not obliged to leave the

¹ *De his qui arma projiciunt in pace, placuit abstineri eos a communione.*

² *The Early Church and the World*, 588 n.

³ *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse* 2e série, 159 n.

army, but he must not shed blood. Nor may a Christian become a soldier. But the importance of this evidence is diminished by the obscurity of the literary history of these Church-Orders and uncertainty regarding the extent to which they were obeyed in the Church.¹

Whatever the authority of such documents may have been, there are indications that individual consciences were not easy about the question of military service. In 341 Martin, afterwards Bishop of Tours, demanded to be released from the army after he had received baptism. The occasion of the request was unfortunate as it was on the eve of battle, and he was naturally accused of cowardice when he said to the Emperor Constans, 'I am a soldier of Christ; I am not allowed to fight.' In order to prove that he was not actuated by fear he offered to place himself in the front line of battle unarmed, but instead he was placed under arrest. The enemy, however, sued for peace before the battle could take place, and Martin obtained his discharge from the army. Some years later Victricius, afterwards Bishop of Rouen, acted similarly. He was beaten and condemned to death, but the sentence was not carried out. This incident may be the less significant for having taken place during the reign of Julian the Apostate, though we have it on the authority of St. Augustine,² that Christian soldiers served under Julian, refusing, however, to take part in idolatrous worship.

A short time before the sack of Rome a pagan, Volusianus by name, attempted to prove the incompatibility of Christianity with good citizenship by citing Christ's command to turn the other cheek to the smiter. On the matter being reported to St. Augustine by his friend Marcellinus the saint replied that Christianity did not oppose the waging of a just war in the cause of humanity, and mentioned the fact that Christ Himself did not command the disarming of those soldiers who approached Him.

¹ For a useful presentation and discussion of this evidence, cf. C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World*, 430-433, 590.

² In *Psalm*, cxxiv.

The views expressed in his letter to Marcellinus he afterwards developed in his great work *De Civitate Dei*, where he also strengthened the faith of those who had identified Christianity so closely with the Roman Empire that they had almost come to believe that their religion as well as their city was doomed. The *Civitas Dei*, he insists, is immeasurably greater than any earthly city, and the *Pax Dei* far more comprehensive than any earthly peace, but the way thither lies through the rising and falling of many cities and the waging of many wars. Until these ideals are attained, and indeed in order to attain them, the Christian must be a patriot and a soldier.

Such was the non-pacifist way of thinking that came to prevail in the Church. The brief survey of pacifist tendencies that we have here undertaken indicates that the Church of the first three centuries had not made up her mind on the Christian attitude towards war. That being the case it would hardly be correct to say that the abandonment of pacifism was part of the price paid by the Church for imperial patronage; but it is possible to argue that in this matter the Church's mind was made up for her rather by the pressure of circumstances than by the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Nevertheless the Church's horror of bloodshed found expression in the exemption of her clergy from military service. The emperors, in making this concession, were merely according to the Christian clergy the same privilege that had been granted to pagan priests. It is interesting to remember that Origen, writing in the middle of the third century, had pointed out that pagan priests enjoyed this exemption and had claimed it for Christians on the ground that all Christians were priests. That the concession which Origen demanded for the universal priesthood of all Christians should in fact have been granted only to the ordained priesthood indicates the progress that the 'double standard' conception of the Christian life was making in the Church, and that in this particular it involved a direct borrowing from paganism is not without significance.

Calvin: A Character Sketch.

BY THE REVEREND A. MITCHELL HUNTER, D.LITT., F.R.S.E., EDINBURGH.

FOR good or evil the system of theology identified with John Calvin has penetrated into all quarters of the world, dominating the thought and directing the energies of millions amongst the most progressive people on earth—this in spite of having been the target of much vitriolic and frequently ill-informed censures. Every such system is inevitably shot through with the personality of its author, and an adequate knowledge of the man Calvin himself is a prime necessity for a just evaluation of his teaching.

The first mention of Calvin in the records of Geneva describes him as 'iste Gallus,' that Frenchman. Nationality explains much, and he is no exception. He was the distillation or incarnation of the peculiar genius of the stock from which he sprang. Picardy, his native province, was the nursery of a race to which liberty was as the breath of life, which held tyranny in abhorrence and strove to assert emancipation from all that shackles mind or soul. 'The Picards,' says Lindsay, 'combined in a singular way fervent enthusiasm with cold tenacity of purpose.' The ancestors of Calvin had been seamen or, at least, boatmen for generations on the river Oise in the north of France, and their calling seems to have bred in them a restless spirit of independence and adventure which strongly marked the family to which he belonged.

Calvin's father exercised an exacting supervision over his family. 'I had a severe father,' says Calvin, 'and I rejoice at it as the source of any virtues I possess.' Calvin's mother, Jeanne le Franc, daughter of a well-to-do innkeeper, was equally distinguished for her beauty of feature and her beauty of soul. John was the second of three brothers, all of whom inherited a disposition to nonconformity. All three started life as *curés* in the cathedral. John had the tonsure but was never in actual orders.

Both pen and brush pictures make us familiar with Calvin's appearance. The earliest of these, executed when he was twenty-five, shows the unmistakable face of the hard student, with the heavy pouched eyes of one who pores incessantly over books, and the lean cadaverous features that betray the physical derangements of which he so soon became the victim. His hair was originally black, but turned white before he was forty. His eyes were his most striking feature, quick in their move-

ments, burning with the spirit that flamed within, charged with a searching and penetrating power felt by all who came beneath their glance or scrutiny, and with a look of resolution which was true to the soul of the man. His emaciated frame latterly became little more than a rickle of bones and nerves. Always the personification of neatness and becomingness in dress, he could not suffer a speck of dust on his clothes when he sallied from his house to take his place in the pulpit. Uncleanliness and untidiness were as distasteful to him as ostentatious display.

Calvin was a sore sufferer practically all his working days, and due allowance for this must be made in accounting for some of his salient characteristics. The studious habits, the unsparing demands he made upon his health and strength along with the insanitary and harsh conditions of life in more than one of the various colleges he attended, brought on digestive troubles which increased in severity and induced serious complications, latterly both arthritic and tubercular. A high-strung temperament aggravated his ailments. When angered or anxious, he tells in a letter, he was apt to eat to excess and devour his meat more eagerly than he should. Latterly, he limited his meals to one a day. He was miserably handicapped and often quite crippled by overmastering headaches, sometimes lasting for three or four days, which were frequently so violent that he would lose consciousness. But such was the indomitable spirit of the man that he would defy the excruciating pain and preach with his usual force during an attack.

Calvin worked with such incessant industry and intense application that he gave himself little chance to regain the health so early lost. His literary output was prodigious. In addition to what survives, there is evidence that whole works disappeared during their transmission to friends for review. Add to these the sheaves of letters destroyed or lost by their recipients which must have amounted to many more than those preserved. Not a few of his letters are of the nature and length of treatises. He wrote with that unflinching uniform rapidity which reminds one of the uncanny swiftness with which Sir Walter Scott covered sheet after sheet. The elaborate answer to Cardinal Sadoletto (extending to forty-four quarto pages in the English translation) was thrown off in one day, and the

pamphlet against Westphal in three days. Secretaries had to be employed to enable him to keep pace with the demands upon his pen, and their post was no sinecure. They had need of the shorthand then in use. One of them writes that he was often overcome with admiration for the impetuosity and rush of the singular eloquence that poured from Calvin's lips.

Like Talleyrand, Napoleon, and other supermen, he was able to do with little sleep, often not more than four hours. After working far into the night, fighting against drowsiness, he would be awake at dawn, conning over, before rising, the studies of the previous day. During the composition of the *Institutes*, according to Du Raimond, his Roman Catholic biographer, he frequently passed whole nights without sleeping, as he did whole days without eating. He was ever commanded by a profound and urgent sense of responsibility. When latterly life was almost an incessant pain, his friends urged him to give up at least dictating and writing, 'Would you that the Lord should find me idle when He comes?' was the answer of a man more relentless to himself than to any other. He left no work half-done. Death did not surprise him with loose ends in his weary fingers.

Seldom did he have leisure to revise his writings before they went to the press. Interruptions to the work of composition were all too common, but fortunately he possessed the faculty of resuming where he left off as though there had been no break in the steady flow of his thought. Only once was a manuscript begun which he failed to complete through getting bogged by the way. His treatise on *Offences* required to be restarted several times, and it was not till four years after its inception that he recaptured the right mood for its completion.

Short intervals of mild recreation he did allow himself. Nothing delighted this bogey man of popular belief more than to relax in play with children. A baby's smile was to him a benediction, and not seldom he would practice the cunning art of luring one to the bright surface of understanding infant eyes. One of his pleasures was the setting up of a Christmas tree in his own house. It was this trait that drew his successor Beza to him at the age of twelve. In one of his sermons Calvin speaks of tennis balls quite intelligently, even of cards he knew enough to be aware of the value of trumps. His own favourite pastime was a game resembling billiards called *Le Clef*, which he would play of an evening at one of the clubs organized by himself in Geneva to supply the place of the demoralizing taverns.

Calvin was possessed of a naturally hot and choleric temper, only too explosive, a temper with a hair-trigger. An extreme sensitiveness, morbid in its touchiness, increased his vulnerability to slights. If the vehemence of his reproaches sometimes surprised his friends who had unwittingly offended, he often writhed under the revilings of his enemies. It galled him bitterly to think that he should be pilloried for scorn or hatred as a pestilent heretic in market-places or at street corners or dinner-parties.

Naturally of a timid disposition and neurotic temperament, he possessed in a high degree the moral courage which could compel him to do what his nature instinctively shrank from. This courage was without doubt sustained by his keen and constant sense of being predestined to a great and sacred vocation which assured him of divine protection against all perils till his appointed work was done. In this he proved how doctrine might be the inspiring and driving power of a life.

Calvin was one of those men of immense vitality who cannot rest in any position save one of dominance. From the beginning of his career he was conceded the first place in all companies as by natural right. Within a year after his conversion he was practically head of the evangelical party. Everywhere men bowed to his pre-eminent power, transcendent abilities and masterful force of sanctified character. To secure his services the authorities of Geneva were willing to submit to any conditions he liked to impose. The law might enact that a magistrate should preside over the Genevan consistory or presbytery, but sixteen years after his death, its members recorded that he had exercised the presidency all his life without having been in any way expressly elected to it, and every one endorsed his assumption of the position with satisfaction and pleasure.

All sorts of people consulted him, from the highest to the lowest in the social scale and about all kinds of things. So deservedly trusted was his far-seeing and penetrating sagacity that with the Reformed Churches everywhere his word was practically law. Even his enemies gave reluctant witness to his natural greatness. Men of the Romish faith, it was said, had calculated his horoscope and discovered that 'the honour of the Roman pontificate was promised Calvin at his birth.' Pope of Geneva, as he was called, or Pope at Rome—he was bound to become either one or the other!

His naturally autocratic disposition, fomented by the deference paid to him, was strengthened by his aristocratic proclivities, perhaps due in some

degree to the circumstances of his early education. In his correspondence with princes and nobles he expresses himself mostly as though speaking to his peers, which might indicate his democratic principles as well as his aristocratic disposition. But he was always most at home with men and women of noble birth or high social position.

Exile as he was from his native land for the greater part of his early life, Calvin's mother-tongue may be said to have been rather Latin than French, Latin being the language of international intercourse in educated circles. When all his energies were latterly bent towards propagating and popularizing the Reformed faith, he set himself to acquire such a command of the French tongue as would make it the obedient servant of his purpose. Such a mastery did he gain of its rich resources, and so did he purify it from its barbarous elements, that his writings are credited with having given an incomparably influential impulse and direction to that development which has resulted in making French a tongue in which eloquence finds its most perfect instrument and song its most charming expression.

Calvin had command of wit of a sort, though it could scarcely be called light-footed, and occasionally was elephantine. Of sarcasm that verged upon the vitriolic, irony that scathed, railery that scintillated, he was a master. His tongue, when irate or bitter, took on an edge and a sting which left a weal on its victim. In his more passionate outbursts he often employs a guillotine to decapitate a fly, and indulges in the unrestrained rudeness and even insolence which was then accepted as part of the genial frankness of controversy. Calvin was a brilliant conversationalist when in good spirits, bubbling over at times with jests and even puns till the company held its sides with laughter. He would smile indulgently while all the clash of the town poured itself out round his table, and chuckle as heartily as any over the hot water into which the eccentric Bonnivard, known to romantic history as the Prisoner of Chillon, had got himself through taking for his second wife the widow of two husbands. We may well regret that no records of his table talk remain to let us see the man in undress mufti.

Calvin's letters, of which over four thousand have been published, provide a mine of valuable material for the elucidation of his thought and the illustration of contemporary history. As the recognized soul and brain of the Reform movement that rapidly spread into all parts of Europe, his correspondents include many of the crowned heads and the leading statesmen of countries to which the yoke of Rome had become galling. From his Genevan

watch-tower Calvin kept an eager and vigilant outlook upon current events, always regarded in their bearing upon the welfare of the infant Protestant Church. His study was a whispering gallery of the world. Europe was in a ferment of disorder. Calvin heard the clash of arms ring out at one time or another in almost every one of its nations. International politics was a tangled skein. Royal ambitions, national jealousies, religious animosities, all played their part then as now, in controlling and directing policies, and Calvin's letters mirror the whole kaleidoscopic business. Sagacious commentaries and shrewd forecasts accompany his references and reports. That he played the part of political prophet more successfully than most aspirants, was due not merely to his possession of the statesman's grasp and instinct of prevision, but to his kinship with the race of Isaiah and Jeremiah who saw far and true because they were given something of the foresight of God Himself.

Calvin was consulted not only on questions in theology and politics. Intellectual snobbishness was not one of his faults. The pebbles at his feet were in their own way as interesting and important as the stars in the heavens. His interest is invoked for an invention in connexion with stoves, and again about a device for the improvement of chimneys. He reviews the qualifications of various damsels to be the wife of a friend. Ministers, who have any money to spare, should entrust it, in his opinion, to an honourable man of business and contentedly accept such a return as might justify them in expecting the divine blessing on its use.

There were no letters into which Calvin so put his whole soul as those of consolation. If he lacked the mind of Christ in some things, his heart was like his Master's, at least, in being deeply moved by his fellows' infirmities, sorrows, and trials. Many of the griefs which cried to him from afar must have touched him with a peculiar poignancy, for he could not but recognize that fidelity to his own leadership had brought them upon the sufferers. 'Six hundred martyrs,' he once said, 'will stand before God as advocates in defence of my doctrine.' Many last letters from those about to die for their faith plunged him into a woe that was touched with a not ignoble pride. He agonized in their agony. 'If Calvin made martyrs,' says Michelet, 'they also made him one.'

Calvin was no narrow-minded theologian. He won his spurs as a humanist, and never ceased to be one. Cicero continued to sit at the busy looms of his brain along with Augustine, and Plautus and Terence helped to spin his web of thought along

with the Christian Fathers. The extent of his classical learning may be gauged from the fact that in his first publication, an edition of Seneca's *De Clementia*, he quotes from no less than fifty-six Latin and twenty-two Greek classical authors, referring to thirty-three works of Cicero, all the works of the fragrant poet Horace, as also of Virgil and Ovid, five plays of Terence, the epics of Homer, half a dozen of the principal works of Aristotle, and four of Plato and of Plutarch. There is a tradition of doubtful authenticity that he read through Cicero once a year.

But of course it was to the study of Christian authors that Calvin primarily devoted himself when once launched upon his chosen career. There are few of the patristic classics to which he does not make reference with an obvious mastery of their teaching and an enviable facility of apt quotation. In a single paragraph of the Preface to the *Institutes*, quotations are made from Aetius, Ambrosius, Spiridon, Augustine, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Pope Callixtus, Pope Gelasius, Cyprian, and Paphnutius. Add to all this rich and varied equipment his wide and accurate knowledge, gained at the universities of Paris and Orleans while qualifying for the legal career destined for him by his father as 'a means of arriving at wealth and honour.' Calvin was indeed as accomplished a lawyer as he was a divine, like the great builders of the Western Church, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, and Gregory the Great. He brought the penetrating acumen and judicial balance of a mind trained in the law's subtleties both to the review of the Mosaic Code, the organization of the infant Reformed Church, and the reconstruction of the economy of the Genevan State. The compilation of a new legal code for the city, at first entrusted to a committee of professional lawyers, was, on their failure to achieve it, transferred to Calvin, who successfully accomplished the responsible task single-handed within a fortnight. Many delicate political negotiations and arbitrations were confided to his sagacity. Calvin would have made an outstanding statesman, had his destiny led him into that precarious and tortuous path.

It may be not without interest to indicate the salary enjoyed by this amazing man. His stipend at Geneva amounted to five hundred florins, along with a house, twelve measures of wheat, and two casks of wine. Doumergue estimates this sum as equivalent to one hundred and sixty pounds (in pre-war value). The expense for the postages of his prodigious correspondence, secretaries, journeys, and other items must have been formidable. His hospi-

talities was known all over Europe, a correspondent affirms, and was taken full advantage of. Strangers from all quarters offered themselves as his guests, and were received with a courteous and willing welcome as of one whose means were as unlimited as his goodwill.

The Council of Geneva recognized at intervals that they must supplement his insufficient means, and the nature of their gifts forms a pathetic revelation. Twice he was presented with a coat, the second one suitable for winter; at another time with a barrel of wine, a liquor much and often in those days disastrously used, as in his case, as a medicine; once ten crowns were bestowed to meet the expenses of an illness. His sturdy independence would not allow him to accept what savoured of sheer charity. In his last months when the Council desired to augment his meagre salary by twenty-five crowns, twice over he declined the money because his scrupulous sense of honour forbade him to take more than he was legally entitled to, all the more that he was unable to do the work for which he was paid.

His books, of course, provided a varying addition to his income, but for a considerable time their sale was so small that little or no profit was made. At his death his total estate amounted to about four hundred pounds, decisive proof of the unworldliness of a man who had occupied a position of incomparable influence and power, besides publishing a library of books whose circulation in the aggregate was very large. Pope Pius IV., on hearing of Calvin's death, said, 'What made the strength of this heretic was that money was nothing to him.'

Calvin's home life was of the most frugal kind. He loved simplicity in food, clothing, and furnishings. An inventory of his house furniture exists in the registers of Geneva from which it appears that its cost amounted to from thirty-five to forty pounds. When Cardinal Sadoletto went incognito to visit him, he was astonished to be directed to a small tenement and to find the door opened at his knock by Calvin himself, dressed very simply. On his expressing surprise, the Reformer made the dignified answer that he did not look to enrich himself and to become great in the world, but to glorify God and to defend His truth. These forthright words are self-revealing.

Whatever sway Calvin exercised over the minds of men by sheer intellectual power, the ultimate secret of his commanding influence was his tremendous moral enthusiasm flaming from a white-hot spiritual conviction. Truth was his pole-star, and righteousness his compass. With unswerving, un-

compromising, and jealous devotion to both, he held on his resolute way, undaunted by threats, undiscouraged by failure, sure that *magna est veritas et prævalet*. Calvin was possessed by the constant sense of a great life's task divinely set him which he must and would accomplish because God was with him. A saying of his was *amanti*

nihil arduum, 'to one who loves nothing is hard.' His faith never fell victim to such agonized tremblings of heart or questionings of soul as often plunged Luther into the depths. His heart was wholly given to God, and the Divine Providence in which he utterly trusted was to him the great reality.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Mixture.

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.,
LISBON.

'Things that accompany salvation.'—Heb 6°.

LEWIS CARROLL wrote *Alice in Wonderland*, and we have all read that; but he wrote also a lot of letters to his little friends, and here is a very pleasant bit from one of them. He is writing to a little girl who had asked him what he would like for his birthday. 'Well,' he says, 'I like very much indeed a little mustard with a bit of beef spread under it; and I like brown sugar—only it should have some apple-pudding mixed with it to keep it from being too sweet; but what I like best of all is salt with some soup poured over it. The use of soup is to hinder the salt from being too dry and it helps to melt it. And I like two or three handfuls of hair—only they should have a little girl's head beneath them to grow on, or else, whenever you open the door, they get blown all over the room, and then they get lost, you know.'

That is very quaint and whimsical, but it is more than that: it has truth in it that is good not only for Lewis Carroll's birthday, but for every day in the life of everybody.

Mustard and sugar and salt and curly hair are all good things, but they need to be mixed with other things. A mouthful of mustard is most unpleasant and sets the tears pouring down. A spoonful of salt will possibly make you violently sick. Sugar alone you soon tire of. And curly hair without the head it belongs to is simply good for nothing at all.

But, on the other hand, beef without mustard is dull; apple pudding without sugar is insipid; soup without salt is tasteless; and a girl's head

without hair is just a horrid grotesque. The beef and the mustard, the pudding and the sugar, the salt and the soup, the head and the hair need each other; and any of them alone is incomplete.

Now instead of thinking of beef and pudding and soup and young heads, think of Life itself. Life needs something to give it zest and sweetness and wholesomeness and grace. I say what it needs is Religion, for that is just what the religion of Jesus Christ does. It should be something which touches all our life in every bit of it. It is not something which can be kept apart from life; and so the Bible talks not only about salvation but about 'the things which accompany salvation,' just as beef and pudding, soup and little heads, accompany mustard and sugar and salt and curly hair.

People have tried to be religious by getting away from life, refusing marriage and family life and home, refusing human friendship, trying to be heavenly by denying the earthly, trying to be divine by ceasing to be human. They failed, of course. They didn't become divine but just inhuman. They didn't get nearer to Christ by keeping away from their fellow-men. Their religion was harsh and hot as a mouthful of mustard; bitter as a spoonful of salt; bald and unsightly as a head without hair. They forgot 'the things which accompany salvation.'

The only proof of salvation is in the things that accompany it. Salvation has come to any one if his faith in Jesus Christ and his love for Him are making him daily a better son, a better brother, a better father, a better friend, more kind and patient and cheerful in all the ways of life. Religion out of touch with life goes bad; it is repellent and unlovely. It has got to be mixed in with everything else. It's no use alone, just as salt and mustard and sugar are unpleasant by themselves alone, and

curls have no beauty without the head that they are meant to adorn. And life without religion is equally an incomplete thing. People don't see that; but it is true.

Think of the life of Jesus. How full of zest it was! You can't imagine Him finding anybody dull, or thinking life in quiet little Nazareth savourless and slow. What a sweetness was through all His life. How crowned it was with grace and beauty! How few lives are like His! And why? Just for the want of what gave these qualities to His life—real religion.

Jesus didn't talk about mustard and sugar and curly hair, but He did talk about salt. He said His followers were to be like salt in the world. He told them to have salt in themselves; and when He said that He was just saying what Lewis Carroll meant when he said salt needed soup poured over it. A boy once wrote in an essay on salt, 'Salt is what makes porridge nasty *if you don't put any in!*' Religion is the salt of life; the thing that keeps it wholesome, preserves it from going bad; it gives sweetness, as sugar does; it gives zest, as mustard does; it crowns it with grace and winsomeness.

Your doctor writes a prescription for you: it states quantities of different things and ends by saying in Latin, 'Mix together.' It comes back from the chemist in a bottle labelled 'The Mixture,' and with the direction, 'Shake the bottle before taking.'

I will give you a prescription for a happy life. Here it is: 'Work, play, friendship, home, school, and the religion of Jesus Christ. Mix and shake well together.'

So religion will permeate life, and life will be crowned by religion and the two will be one, as they were in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Flying the Flag.

BY THE REVEREND CHAS. M. HEPBURN, B.D.,
MOULIN, PITLOCHRY.

'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.'—Jn 15¹³.

I want to start by telling a story of a wonderful deed which was done in China some weeks ago. Although worthy of the Victoria Cross it occupied only a very small corner of the newspaper. It concerned a missionary, Dr. Wyatt by name. Along with three friends Dr. Wyatt was motoring in the province of Shansi, where a terrible war is going on, when quite unexpectedly they were fired at. A bullet smashed the driver's wrist and the car stopped. Dr. Wyatt jumped out at once,

seized a Union Jack which was on the car, and vigorously waved it at the attackers. In spite of that the shooting continued. One lady in the car was shot, whereupon the other lady and gentleman sprang out and sought refuge underneath it. But not so Dr. Wyatt. Quickly he hoisted the wounded Chinese driver on his back, staggered across the bullet-swept road, and was jumping into a ditch when he was shot, but with very great bravery went on waving his Union Jack until he died. I may add that when the Chinese sharpshooters realized their mistake and that the motorists were friends, not foes, they expressed real sorrow, and did all they could to make amends.

I think now that good man's gallantry may teach us two things. On the one hand this, that Dr. Wyatt kept the flag of his country flying. So every true citizen will, like him, not want to lower his country's flag, which isn't merely a scrap of cloth, but a symbol of whatever ideals one's country stands for. A tale is told of a sturdy old admiral, Admiral Duncan, who was born near Dundee, that he chose to do battle with his enemy's ships in shallow water, because, said he, should his ship go down the top of the mast with the flag flying would still be showing. So at no time and in no fashion should we do anything to disgrace the flag or the reputation of our country. See to it that like both these brave men you by your courage and your loyalty keep the flag of your country flying.

Ah, but Dr. Wyatt on the other hand did something more, something even better, for he didn't just keep his country's flag flying, but by his glorious and unselfish action upheld the flag of Jesus Christ. Our Saviour said, 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.' And here was a heroic Christian man who laid down his, not for any much-loved friend, but for a poor Chinaman, whom very few would have tried to succour. Such wondrous self-sacrifice truly was flying the Saviour's flag. Other persons, one is glad to think, are doing that, too, in various ways. One German pastor is in prison simply because he has dared to say, 'We must obey God rather than men.' Shall we try to be as fearless for Christ, and with stout hearts unfurl His flag? Shall we dare to say this . . .

I'm not ashamed to own my Lord,
or to defend his cause,
Maintain the glory of his cross,
and honour all his laws.

Boys and girls, in doing that you will be keeping the flag of your Saviour flying.

The Christian Year.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Beginning of Wisdom.

'The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.'—Pr 9¹⁰.

Proverbs forms part of what is known as the Wisdom Literature of the Hebrews, because of the stress it lays upon the worth of wisdom: 'Wisdom is the principal thing,' 'With all thy getting, get wisdom,' such are the exhortations constantly addressed to the reader.

What is this wisdom? let us ask first of all, so as to make sure of our bearings. Is it a kind of secret doctrine about the nature of God, speculations concerning the universe or the human soul, glimpses into hidden mysteries or the final consummation of the ages? No, there is nothing mystical or visionary in these chapters at all. The Hebrew mind is nothing if not concrete; just as Jesus Christ threw all His principles into story form—because there is nothing so 'telling,' in the true sense of the term, as a story—so, for example, where we should say 'Union is strength,' it comes natural to the Hebrew to express the same idea in the phrase, 'With two dogs they killed a lion.' Instead of an abstract notion there is a vivid picture—and it sticks: one sees the two dogs getting the fierce lion under by a concerted attack, whereas, singly, they would have been no match at all for the huge brute.

So in the present case, the 'wisdom' of the Book of Proverbs is not speculative affair, but practical to a degree. The Book of Proverbs drives at practice all the way. Not only so, but its exhortations and reflections come straight home to men; they appeal to the large unchanging factor in our composition. If you want to feel how essentially identical human nature twenty-five centuries ago was with the human nature of to-day, in spite of all the dizzy rush of inventions and the rest, let us read the Book of Proverbs, and see if it does not find us.

We can go to these ancient deliverances on the wisdom of life, and put our questions: On what terms is life to be lived? In what way is the maximum of personal happiness to be extracted from it? Is the highest wisdom a careful regard to one's own interests? Or again, may not the true philosophy be this, which we find expressed in one of the Apocryphal books: 'Our allotted time is the passing of a shadow, and there is no putting back of our end. Come, therefore, and let us enjoy the

good things that now are. Let us crown ourselves with rosebuds ere they be withered, because this is our portion and our end is this.' Alas, this materialistic philosophy has been tried again and again, and always failed, always ended upon a note of despair. Live as though the world held no higher content than material gain or material pleasure, and we are bound to find it a woefully unsatisfactory place; try to minister to our own egoism, and though we be the most successful egoists, we are bound to finish with the disgusted confession of Ecclesiastes, declaring all things vanity and striving after wind.

No, but the principal thing for those who would make a success of life is wisdom, and that not in the sense of mere worldly prudence, but a recognition of the true basis of our individual existence and the order of the world; and the very beginning of wisdom, we read, the first condition of living aright, is the fear of God.

We do not hear so much of the fear of God nowadays as was customary in former generations. Earlier generations yielded more easily to theological terrorism. And then we also feel, or at least most modern people feel, that fear is by no means a high motive. If the fear of God signified only the terror of punishment and Divine vengeance, such a motive might restrain a man from this and that form of wickedness, but one would not call that even the beginning of wisdom.

But there is a true fear of God, which is quite a different emotion. It is a holy awe, a feeling that all this wondrous universe is the manifestation of infinite Purpose, and that in all this scene of ordered splendour we, too, have our place, with this difference, which exalts us above stars and suns, that it lies with us to fill our part well and creditably if we will. We are called to be fellow-workers with God, but not as bond-slaves. Such a consciousness has nothing in common with terror or cowardice: it is, on the contrary, fraught with a new sense of confidence, if also necessarily a new sense of responsibility. This fear of God, or awe of God, gives meaning and content to life.

Let us see how it affects us and operates on us in relation to the world, in our relations to others, and in relation to ourselves.

And first, *in relation to the world*. Apart from belief in God, the very vastness of the universe is enough to give one at times a feeling of frightened forlornness. But once the sense of God's presence in it all and over all makes itself felt, our dread gives place to confidence. If this is God's universe, then it is friendly to God's children; its forces ask

to be used for our benefit, its secrets wait to be discovered, its resources are ours if we will set ourselves to develop them; yes, its very difficulties are intended to test and brace us, to challenge us and make us stronger. That is the true attitude towards the world—to regard it as the scene of Divine opportunity, of Divine discipline—and the man or woman who does so regard it, so uses as not abusing it, is the one who will achieve the truest success and know the highest joy. No atheistic or materialistic view of the world can give us that assurance, can supply that dynamic; that is why the sense of God's overruling Mind and Might is the beginning of wisdom.

And the same holds true *in regard to our relations to each other*. We begin to be wise when we realize that the moral, like the physical, universe is held together by an august and inviolable law which respects its respecters, and breaks its breakers. It is of God's ordinance. 'He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?' When men ruthlessly exploit their fellow-creatures, coin the misery of the economically helpless into gold, shall we not say in plain terms that what is lacking in their hearts is the fear of God, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity? When civilized nations aid and abet each other in nefarious plans for filching from another, weaker, less civilized people its land and liberty, or when they cultivate distrust and illwill against each other until the dreadful arbitrament of war seems the only way to cut the Gordian knot skilfully made by diplomacy, has not the fear of God's statutes vanished from their darkened minds? To have that fear is the beginning of a true estimate of life; it is to begin to see light in God's light shining through the tangled undergrowth of passion, greed, selfseeking; it is to rise above the ethics of the jungle, which still rule over large tracts of business, while they are supreme in international relationships, where we seem to have hardly emerged from the savage state as yet. But God's law is not merely to be feared; when we recognize its beneficent nature and intent, when we perceive that in fulfilling it we fulfil our own highest possibilities, then we arrive at the stage when we render it our unforced homage, our free and glad obedience, and know it for the law of liberty, the law of Christ, the law of love. 'A new commandment give I unto you—that ye love one another.'

How does this fear of God operate *in relation to the individual soul*? To know at each moment that we hold whatever powers we possess under

God and from Him; that we are responsible to Him for the use we make of our faculties; that we stand in a direct, close and intimate relation to One who knows us altogether—that is at once a sobering and an uplifting consciousness; it is in this that men and women have found the strength to overcome the world, to despise its paltry bribes, to withstand its angry threats, to keep their hands clean and their hearts unenslaved, and to tread sin underfoot. Once a soul truly fears God he is liberated from every other fear. In this same consciousness, too, our sorrows may be bravely and patiently borne. We do not fear Him as a tyrant, but reverence Him as a parent, whose whole intent towards us is good and gracious; and in His strong hand, though many a hope may fail, and many a star grow dim in the heavens, and the solid ground rock beneath our feet, we are safe. In this world, and in all worlds, we are safe. In a multitude or alone, we are safe. For to fear Him is to trust Him, and to commit our spirits to Him—all whose tenderness we have seen shining in the face of Jesus Christ—for time and eternity. 'The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom,' says the Old Dispensation; 'but,' adds and completes the New, 'perfect love casteth out fear.'¹

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Sympathy and Service.

'And I sat where they sat.'—Ezk 3¹⁶.

There is a verse in one of the later poets of the Roman Empire which is familiar and often quoted. Freely translated it runs: 'I am a man, and I count nothing human foreign to me.' I estrange myself, alienate myself, separate myself from nothing human.

The saying expresses concisely the spirit of service, the spirit of every man who, in devoted sympathy, aspires to do anything for man. God's work in the world is done by the man who mingles with men as one of themselves. Ezekiel had something great to do for God among his captive fellow-countrymen; and this is the first step towards his task. 'I came to them of the captivity at Tel-abib, and I sat where they sat.'

How differently men are related to their fellow-men, in their thoughts about them. There is love and sympathy and honour and yearning compassion, or there is contempt and depreciation, and hard, cruel speech. Think of Napoleon—think of David Livingstone. There are cynics like Swift,

¹ J. Warschauer, *The Way of Understanding*, 12.

who, from an altitude of assumed superiority, look in cold and curious contempt on the life beneath them, who expose human nature unsparingly in its meannesses and weaknesses, and lash it with the strokes of merciless satire to the accompaniment of a shrill laughter, the bitter mockery of which repels us. But there are also those, writers and speakers and workers, who are beside the people. There are patriots, like Mazzini, who fling themselves into the stress of the human struggle for liberty, consumed by a passion for men, even while disappointed and saddened by the unworthiness of those they so nobly serve. There are poets, like Burns, who, from the midst of the people, sing for the people, giving voice to their common life in its joy and love and sorrow and longing, singing for them only because they have shared it all. There are philanthropists, there are social reformers, there are missionary heroes, who take their lives down into the crowded places of human want and misery and sin.

Ezekiel was of a priestly family, and therefore of high rank among his people. Probably he looked forward to the service of the priesthood as his life-work. But it was not so to be. When Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem, Ezekiel was one of those who were carried captive to Babylon. His prospects were suddenly blighted, and his whole life altered. For five years after his exile we know and hear nothing of him. Then suddenly the Spirit of God fell upon Ezekiel, and he felt called, not to the priestly, but to the prophetic office. He was not to minister to the people from above them as a priest, but to minister among them as a prophet.

And first he must come to know them, their thoughts, their burdens, their aspirations. So he lived among them, and the text puts it in this suggestive and memorable clause—‘I sat where they sat.’ This is where you find the prophet, the teacher, the pastor, the reformer, the helper, the Saviour. They can serve God to no good purpose anywhere else.

There are places in life where men sit together. Life has its well-defined spheres. Men gather into quarters, into classes and societies. And whether they be great or humble, high or low, God’s prophet and watchman must go to the place where the men and women whom he would serve wait for him, and must sit where they sit.

Or, if we take life from another viewpoint which is more important, we find that there are not only these places of varied circumstance and condition but also the places of experience. Human experiences are common and universal because they are

human. There are the places of sorrow and the places of joy. There are the places of bitter repentance; there are places of calm peace and serene content; places of darkness and the shadow of death. And we pass from one to another. Experience sends us to what is for us a strange land; and it is well for us then, if in God’s infinite goodness and mercy we find beside us there one whom God has sent to sit where we sit, to walk where we walk.

So the thought which we find in our text is simple enough. It is just this—that we cannot influence men and women from a distance. We must come into touch with them.

We have an evident illustration and application of this in what is a feature of modern religious enterprise—the institution of Settlements in the poorest districts of great cities. In these Settlements the workers live among the people.

And so it is all over the world. We do not bring the heathen to Christianity by sending them Bibles which they cannot read. Some must go among them and sit where they sit, learn all their language, and look upon all their life, and enter in thought and sympathy into their need. The command may come upon us to go to such places and such people and sit where they sit. But, even if we cannot share the service thus, let us see that we do not forget the loving watchers of God in the mission-outposts.

But surely there is an aspect and an application of this which none of us can escape. Whether we will or not, we are in continual and close contact with our fellows in all their varying conditions and circumstances and experiences.

When some one is in distress, or in disgrace, we may draw near him and let him understand that, as far as we can, we have thought ourselves into his life, and that what we can do for his heartening and help we will.

It would be good for us all to think of this more than we do. Let the soul have outlet in a wider range of thought and sympathy. Try to sit in soul where they sit who are not of our class or respectability, or education, or opinion, or belief. Only so can come the large charity and the helpful life and co-operation and brotherhood by which the world will be redeemed from selfishness, from the ills that arise from the isolation of life from life, when all seek their own, and think of their own, and look not also on the things of others.

The secret of the prophet’s service is the secret of our salvation.

What is the meaning of Christ and His Holy Incarnation? The Son of God comes down among

men. He shares the experience of our mortal flesh. He passes into a fellow-feeling with our human ills and needs until they lie upon Him with a weight untold. He feels the burden of our sin. He bears it on His Heart upon the Cross.

Think of the baptism of Jesus. Why was He there among the penitents making the plunge in the rushing waters? He went with the crowd; He sat where they sat. He was beside them listening to the stern words of the desert preacher. He was beside them in their tears of confession. He was beside them in their plunge in the river, identified with them though sinless Himself. That was sympathy, the sympathy by which we are saved.

Truly, never any man did much for the world who did not feel as Christ felt for men. All the good is born of sympathy. We can never bless the world by sitting apart. We can help men only as we make common cause with them, as we sit where they sit in their captivity, as we get beneath their burdens. We see it in the Cross; and the love of Christ constraineth us. He sets us beside those who are waiting for our help, saying, 'A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.'¹

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Modern Substitute for the Gospel.

'Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? may I not wash in them, and be clean?'—2 K 5¹².

Stevenson, in a charming letter dated September 1873, has described a day's walk in Fife, during which he came upon a labourer cleaning a byre, and fell into conversation. As they talked together of this and that, one simple but memorable remark betrayed the real man—'Him that has aye something ayont need never be weary.' 'And that,' comments Stevenson, 'from a man cleaning a byre!'

It is the apprehension of 'something beyond' which is the root of all religion. It is hard to find an adequate definition of religion, but we can at least point to one element linking all the religions of the world together, one common irreducible factor in which the very essence of religion appears to reside: the conviction, namely, of the reality of a world unseen, the sense that behind and beyond and above the material environment that we can touch and handle and control there lies something

more, something which calls and signals to what is best within us, as deep calls to deep—in short, as Robert Browning put it,

The feeling that there's God, He reigns and
rules

Out of this low world.

Life presents us with two fundamental facts—man's search for God, God's search for man. But the strange, disquieting thing is that, though each is searching for the other, so often they fail to meet. There are moods in which religious feelings refuse to come, and days when spiritual perception has ebbed quite away. You say your prayers, but it is like talking into the air: you have no vivid sense of any God who is listening. Perhaps after a while you stop praying altogether. What is the use of persevering, you say, when the whole thing has grown unreal? It is the ever-old, ever-new problem: 'O that I knew where I might find Him!'

It brings a host of questions in its train. Is He a God who knows anything about it when things in my little corner of the universe get tangled and go wrong, and my heart is hurt and sore? Is He a God who can lay any hand of healing peace upon my soul when I am rushed and tired and growing hector? Is He a God who has anything to say to a man left walking in the dark, when some of the kindly lights of life have gone out? Above all, is He a God who can help me when I have done something for which I hate myself? Has He any understanding and compassion and forgiveness and renewal for one who is feeling wretched and miserable and ashamed? Oh that I knew!

'I can't see God anywhere. I can't realize Him in personal experience.' That, for countless thousands to-day is the great crucial problem of religion and life. Indeed, many in our generation are feeling the problem so acutely that they are almost prepared to drop the religion of their fathers altogether, and to look out for some alternative.

Undoubtedly, the Great War, and even more, the heaped-up disillusionments of the post-war years, have contributed to this result. Take a book like Vera Brittain's *Testament of Youth*, one of the most significant and revealing documents of our times. Some of you may remember how she tells that one of her earliest childhood memories concerned the accession of King Edward VII. to the throne, and the postponement of the coronation owing to the King's sudden illness. 'That night,' she says, 'I prayed earnestly to God to make the dear King better and let him live. The fact that

¹ J. Rutherford, *The Seer's House*, 101.

he actually did recover established in me a touching faith in the efficacy of prayer, which superstitiously survived until the Great War proved to me, once for all, that there was nothing in it.' That challenging sentence is typical of the revolt in religion. Beliefs once regarded as fixed and settled have had their foundations shaken. And many are on the look-out now for some alternative to religious faith, some substitute for the gospel of Christ.

Now the point to notice is this. That alternative is ready to hand. A new religion has appeared on the field. It is the worship, not of God, but of man. This is the most serious rival that Christianity in this generation is facing.

It is usually called humanism. But the name matters little: it is the thing—the attitude of mind, the way of life—with which we are concerned. Historically, of course, there have been many brands of humanism. But, broadly speaking, what confronts us to-day as the declared rival of the Christian faith is the theory that puts man in the centre of the picture; that summons him—the old accepted standards of ethics having been eaten away by what Lippmann has called 'the acids of modernity'—to work out his own salvation and construct his own scheme of values; that pins its faith to science and education and mechanism and human brains for the redeeming of the world, rather than to grace and the divine initiative; that seeks, with the aid of psychology, to explain away the supernatural element in religion, reducing Christian belief to mere 'phantasy-thinking' or 'projection'; that substitutes self-expression for Christ's demand of self-surrender, the dictatorship of instinct for the rule of God, and culture for the Cross.

Let us, however, give this rival creed its due. There are scores of thousands of people to-day—especially young men and women—for whom organized religion has lost its grip; and when these, sincerely seeking for something that may fill up what H. G. Wells has called 'the God-shaped blank in their heart,' turn to one or another of the different substitutes for religion now offering themselves, it is doing the cause of Christ no service simply to denounce their revolt. Sympathy and an understanding heart—these we require. Admittedly, what we are witnessing is a revolt; but when you have called it that, you have not necessarily discredited it. For, as Canon F. R. Barry has incisively reminded us, 'Mrs. Grundy, when all is said and done, was not a pattern of Christian conduct.' Nor can any one seriously deny that between the mind of Christ on the one hand, and conventional

Christian ethics on the other, there has sometimes been a deep divergence: witness the toleration too often in the past extended by the ethical standards of the time to such things as wars of aggression, and slums, and desperate inequalities, and villainous social conditions.

Nor should it be forgotten that the movement of revolt, at its best, has been a challenge to religion to rescue for the praise and service of God the glories of art and beauty; and that, again through its best representatives, it has been a constant reminder that it is our duty to keep religion free from the obscurantist spirit which is fundamentally irreligious, and to welcome new knowledge eagerly.

The trouble about the modern worship of humanity is that it is *too* human. It cannot see beyond man. It has nothing more satisfying to offer the hungry world than the religion of 'disinterestedness, detachment, and maturity of character,' which Lippmann so eloquently preaches: 'Stoicism in plus-fours,' as Canon Barry perhaps rather irreverently calls it. But this is to misunderstand completely the real problem mankind is facing. Naaman might extol his Abana and Pharpar: but the one question which mattered was, 'Could they make a leper clean?' And our modern vaunted Abanas and Pharpars—the disinterestedness and the culture and the scientific spirit of the age—have undoubtedly much to contribute to the welfare of the race. But that is not the question. The question is, Have they cleansing and regenerating power? A power that is more than human must come into action. *Go, wash in Jordan.*

The rock on which our modern substitutes for the gospel go to pieces is the basic fact of sin. Lippmann himself, at the outset of his *Preface to Morals*, makes the significant confession: 'We have come to see that Huxley was right when he said that "a man's worst difficulties begin when he is able to do as he likes." The evidences of these greater difficulties lie all about us.' And in this age, when scores of voices are perpetrating the fallacy that man can have, and ought to have, absolute, unbridled freedom to do as he likes, and to drive his way down any path of self-expression that he chooses, when so many others (taking their cue from that) begin to believe that almost anything can be justified in the sacred name of the new morality, we need to have it written upon our minds, as with a pen of iron on the rock, that God's will, God's truth, God's throne, God's everlasting decisive difference between right and wrong, that difference for which Christ died, stand as fast and as

binding as ever, and claim every decent soul's allegiance.

Eliminate the supernatural, we are being told, if you would be a realist. How often that singularly inept and muddled argument is reiterated! The fact of the matter is that it is precisely the man who believes in the supernatural with all his being (using that word as referring to an order above the natural, prior to it, controlling it and holding it together), it is he who is the only true realist. For he knows better than to allow the visible and the tangible and the material to obsess and tyrannize him. He has seen deep enough into the heart of life to realize once for all that the real forces are the invisible ones. You can't see personality. Yet what a force personality is! You can't see love. But let love get hold of a man, and it can transform him utterly. You can't see life. Yet life is the most creative thing in the universe. And as the invisible things—personality and love and life and beauty and truth and goodness—are all summed up in God, the religious faith which lives, moves, and has its being in God is the true and final realism.¹

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Abraham's Altar.

BY THE REVEREND G. HOLLAND WILLIAMS, M.A.,
LITTLE SUTTON, CHESHIRE.

'And he went . . . unto the place where his tent had been at the beginning, between Beth-el and Ai; unto the place of the altar, which he had made there at the first; and there Abram called on the name of the Lord.'—Gn 13³ * (R.V.).

Though the whole land of Canaan lay before Abraham when he, and his wife, and all that he had, returned from their migration to Egypt, he made directly for the site of his old encampment near Bethel and the altar which he had built there when first he arrived in the Promised Land. It was not because the country between Bethel and Ai was familiar ground, or because there was good pasture land in that neighbourhood, that he turned towards it once again. It was the altar that drew him. He had come out of Egypt conscious of certain deep spiritual needs, and he knew that it was only the God whom that altar represented who could satisfy those needs, and give rest to his soul.

The message of this ancient story for us is that we, too, need an altar to which we may, and must, come back again and again: and the story itself suggests three reasons why this is so.

¹ J. S. Stewart, *The Gates of New Life*, 170.

(1) We need an altar to turn to *amid the busy-ness of life*. Abraham, since leaving Ur of the Chaldees, had moved in 'the silence that is in the starry sky, the sleep that is among the lonely hills.' Life for him had been leisurely and unhurried. But Egypt was the home of an advanced civilization, and the scene of great busy-ness. The pace of life on the banks of the Nile was faster than on the hills of Canaan, and Abraham, in the effort to adapt himself to his new surroundings, would inevitably tax his resources both of body and of mind, and would soon feel exhausted and in need of inward reinforcement. Therefore, as he left Egypt behind him, he turned towards the altar between Bethel and Ai, that he might feel the hand of God laid upon his spirit, restoring that poise and strength of soul which the bustle of Egypt had well-nigh worn away.

We too need an altar where the ravages which the world's busy-ness makes upon us may be repaired. In a thousand ways, the speed at which we live to-day has been accelerated, not only in the crowded cities but in the quiet country places as well. In many instances the effort to keep up with the new pace leads to nervous breakdowns, and where these do not result, still the pace tells. It has been said that nowadays the faces of most men and women wear a tired and spiritless look, as though the rush of modern life had drained them of all vitality. And do not we ourselves know that this observation is not far from the truth? We, too, like Abraham in Egypt, are unable to 'stand the pace': we, too, are conscious of our continual need of being refreshed and stabilized in body, mind, and soul. Happy are we if, again like Abraham, we know where to turn. Happy are we if in our lives there is an altar to which we continually resort, and a God whose power to give us peace we have thoroughly proved. Faith in Him has been called 'the best preventative against the maladies of the soul, and the most powerful means of curing them'; and quiet fellowship with Him can restore the soul and dissipate that tiredness which is the price of living in the modern world. For it is written: 'Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fail: But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint.'

(2) We need an altar to turn to *in our times of prosperity*. Abraham, when he came out of Egypt, was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold. He had sheep, and oxen, and servants, and camels.

And, man of property that he was, he turned instinctively to the altar at which he had worshipped God in the days when he was not so well-to-do. For he knew well what perils lurk in prosperity, and how wealth may destroy the finer feelings of the soul, alienating a man from God and estranging him from his brethren. And knowing this he fell back upon God, that he might be strengthened to carry his full cup with a steady hand and a humble heart, and that he might learn afresh from God what it is that really matters, and what we are really here for. Knowing that prosperity may lure men to adopt unreal values and to cherish unworthy aims, he longed for a saving vision of life as God sees it, and journeyed to the altar between Bethel and Ai.

Prosperity has still its perils, and there is no saving of us from them unless we turn continually to the altar and return to life with the true vision of its meaning and purpose given us there.

(3) We need an altar to turn to *when we have sinned*. Abraham in Egypt had sinned a great sin. Outwardly he was none the worse for it; indeed, it was to that sin that he owed his great prosperity. But, for all his flocks and herds, he was not at peace. It was not merely that he had incurred Pharaoh's disapproval, and still smarted from his rebuke. It was the sting of his own conscience that troubled him, and the knowledge that he had done that which was evil in God's sight. And he knew that there could be no rest for his spirit until, at that altar, he had made humble confession of his sin, and had received forgiveness.

There are those who have no sense of sin, to whom Abraham's experience is a thing unknown. But others of us know it only too well. We too have lived with an accusing conscience. We too have known that we had sinned not merely against our own souls, not merely against our fellow-man, but against the Most High God; and we have known that until we confessed our sin, and received His forgiveness, we should never be at peace within. We have been bowed down beneath a sense of uncleanness, and have felt that at all costs, by all means, our hearts must be made clean within us. We have been conscious of our intolerable separation from God, and we have felt that, above all else that we need, we must be restored to His fellowship, or we perish. How well we understand Abraham's experience, and the urge which drove him to his altar!

If there be no such altar in our lives, at which God meets us in forgiveness, we are of all men most

miserable, and nothing is left for us but a darkness of despair, like that which Judas knew, which we shall at last find unbearable. But blessed are we if we know beyond dispute that God does answer our cry for cleansing and reconciliation in Jesus Christ His Son, our Saviour. Blessed are we if we have proved for ourselves, again and again in the past, that 'He pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel.' If we know this to be true, if for us life holds an altar where we have been oft and much forgiven, let us hasten thither now, that we may acknowledge our transgression and find, through God's grace, a forgiveness which is as full as it is undeserved.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Last Judgment.

'Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.'—Mt 25⁴⁶.

This parable presents certain astonishing features which, once they deeply engage mind and heart, lead into strange places. Most astonishing of all is this: Jesus knew that He was about to die on the Cross, betrayed, lonely, mocked, and yet He dares to speak these august words; dares to speak of His own coming in glory attended by holy angels, and of His facing the whole race of mankind and pronouncing sentence of destiny as their sole judge. Let this be well pondered by those who take Jesus to be something less than His Church takes Him to be—to be perhaps the world's greatest moralist and religious genius, but still no more than man.

Again, is it not astonishing to have presented to us the possibility of a sharp decisive judgment being made between man and man? The Syrian shepherd can simply and certainly distinguish between white-fleeced sheep and black-fleeced goats; there is no possibility of error in his division. Can it really be that men in the end will fall apart so unambiguously as that?

In men whom men condemn as ill
I find so much of goodness still;
In men whom men pronounce divine
I find so much of sin and blot
I do not dare to draw a line
Between the two, where God has not.

Every experienced and sensitive observer of human nature will tend to take up some such attitude as he looks out on the baffling mixture of good and evil in his fellows and inward upon himself. But this parable, and much more than this parable

in the teaching of Jesus, would seem to bear out that there is a divine criterion which finally and sharply decides not merely between good and evil in the abstract, but personally between good and evil men. We cannot judge; we ought not to judge; nothing can be more certain than that. But is that only because our impure vision prevents us from seeing? Is the truth that beneath what seems to us a baffling medley of good and evil, wheat and tares inextricably rooted together, there is clearly discernible to the eyes of God a prevailing direction of character, a set of the soul, a ruling passion which either seals men to sonship in His family or brands them as His enemies? Let no shuffling with the moral issues of our personal lives prevent us from facing this formidable question.

Once again, how astonishing are those simple words of our text! How seriously do we take them? Is it possible that below the appearances of sense and outward things, beyond the apprehensions of thought, but nevertheless in very fact and truth, the being and the feeling of Christ are bound up with every individual human life? In some real sense, some very profound and intimate sense, does Christ Himself come to our door with every beggar? Is human nature so sacred as that? Are the everyday contacts of life indeed so fateful as that?

At any rate, two plain teachings shine through this parable of judgment. The first is this: the decisive test of character occurs, not in any abstract realm whatever, but in those concrete situations of life, where, person confronting person, the demand arises for fully personal deed and dealing. Chesterton says somewhere that a man can make only one great discovery, namely, that there are other persons in the world besides himself. Persons have their private and peculiar ideas, feelings and needs organized in an inaccessible citadel of independence, and therefore create a situation of problem and responsibility. Once made or even glimpsed, this discovery of the other person is deeply disturbing to the egotism of human nature, so disturbing that we are all adepts at evading the responsibilities which it imposes. The crudest way of evasion/is to ride rough-shod over the other person, thus denying the reality of his personal being by seeking to exploit, enslave or crush him. The feeblest way of evasion is flight. A highland boatman once said, 'There is nothing like the fishing. When you are out fishing, you are interfering with nobody, and nobody is interfering with you, and you are fishing all the time.' This is no doubt an excellent sentiment in its particular reference, but it is craven and

disastrous when it is erected into a principle of living.

The former Prince of Wales once spoke this memorable sentence, 'Number 10 Downing Street can never be a substitute for the good neighbour.' That goes deep. Neighbourliness, immediate personal contacts, the courageous embracing of all the risks and responsibilities involved in fully personal relations—these are the bloodstream of a healthy society and a condition of sound personal character. In their absence the more abstract kind of long-range action which, be it granted, is also necessary in an intricate social structure, remains heartless and lifeless. The teaching of our parable is that by such personal attitudes and actions men will finally be judged. Not where theory is argued against theory or where creed challenges creed, but where theory and creed livingly express themselves in the bearing of man to man, in the responsible encounter between persons—there the character is shaped by which the destiny is decided.

Secondly, and within this sphere of personal relationships, men will be judged by the reality of their interest in the unfortunate, by the quality of their compassionate love. Not only from this parable but also from much else in His teaching and from the whole tenor of His life, we can see that Jesus looked upon life as offering one supreme chance of noble action—the chance of lifting or lessening the burdens which weigh men down. He saw all about Him hungry, lonely, sick and guilty men and women; really saw them; saw them not as inanimate scenery or familiar furniture; did not look upon them as though they were broken-down carts, or scarecrows in a field, that do not matter; but saw them as wounded and suffering men and women. Their existence called Him, made Him responsible, moved Him to think and act. So, moved with compassion, Christ went about doing good, and at the last gave Himself to lift the heaviest burden from humanity. That life, that spirit, will be the judge of our lives and spirits; this will be demanded of us in the day of judgment—did we notice Lazarus, or did we manage to be blind to his existence? Seeing him, did we do anything? Did we notice that Lazarus is *always* at our gate? And did we go on doing something as a life-habit, as the normal expression of a settled disposition of the heart?

Some of the younger men and women have not yet chosen their careers. Let them take time before they do so to look without shrinking into the face of the world's suffering and to listen with heart and

imagination to such accounts of it as this of Schweitzer's, written from West Africa.

'Physical misery is great everywhere out here. Are we justified in shutting our eyes and ignoring it because our European newspapers tell us nothing about it? We civilized people have been spoilt. If any one is ill, a doctor comes at once. Is an operation necessary, the door of some hospital or other opens to us immediately. But let every one reflect on the meaning of the fact that out here millions and millions live without help, or hope of it. Every day thousands upon thousands endure

the most terrible sufferings, though medical science could avert them. Every day there prevails in many and many a far-off hut a despair which we could banish. . . . It is time that we should wake from slumber and face our responsibilities.'

If they let the spirit of such an appeal help to settle their choice of a career, then they will be reckoning not with to-day and to-morrow only, but also, if this gospel of Christ is God's holy and eternal truth, they will be reckoning with God's final judgment upon their lives.¹

¹ A. C. Craig, *University Sermons*, 50.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

JEWISH works of importance still continue to appear in Germany. The fifth part of Finkelstein's great edition of *Siphre zu Deuteronomium*¹ carries the work on from Dt 22³ to 26¹². The high standard reached in the earlier parts of the book is well maintained, and, when complete, the whole will form a great monument of accurate and painstaking scholarship.

To the same general class of literature belongs the *Sifra*, of which a German translation has recently been issued.² The *Sifra* is a 'practical' commentary on Leviticus, and, in its original form, it is ascribed to Rabbi Jehudah ben Eleai, a Jewish scholar of about A.D. 150. It has, no doubt, received a number of additions since Rabbi Jehudah's time, but it still serves as a valuable guide to Jewish thought in the age immediately following the great Akiba. In general treatment it resembles the Mishnah, and Dr. Winter has done well to make frequent reference to the Mishnah in his footnotes. The student would do well to have the latter work beside him when reading the *Sifra*. The subject, however, is approached from a different point of view. While the Mishnah is primarily concerned with codifying ancient practice, and with

laying down rules for the exact observance of the Law, whose text is introduced from time to time in order to establish its position, the *Sifra* is an actual commentary, and quotes the ritual in illustration of the text. The treatment is as thorough as it could be. At the start the thirteen rules of exegesis, attributed to R. Ishmael, are expounded. Every verse—almost every word—is discussed, and all relevant opinions of any importance are cited. *Sifra* is thus a comprehensive collection of early Rabbinic studies in the Book of Leviticus, and gives us a valuable picture of the Jewish scholarly mind. The translation is accurate and literal, often so literal that a reader unfamiliar with Rabbinic phraseology may sometimes miss the meaning. A much larger number of explanatory footnotes would have been a help to the general public.

¹ *Siphre zu Deuteronomium*, pt. v. ed. by Dr. Louis Finkelstein (Stefan Münz, Breslau; RM.6.00). (See also EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvii. 429, 522, 565; xlviii. 523.)

² *Sifra*, Uebersetzt von Dr. Jakob Winter (Stefan Münz, Breslau; RM.28.00).

Another Jewish work of a very different kind is Maximilian Landau's *Beiträge zum Chazarenproblem*.³ The history of that strange kingdom of southern Russia, in which contemporary Jews saw a revival of the tribe of Simeon, is still marked by gaps and obscurities. The royal house, and, possibly, a large proportion of the people, accepted Judaism, though opinions differ as to whether this conversion took place in the seventh or in the eighth century. There is a list of kings ('Chagan' was their title) with good Biblical names, among the last before the conquest of the race by Russia being a certain Joseph. Naturally the Chazar

³ Stefan Münz, Breslau; RM.2.00.

court was a place of refuge for persecuted Jews from all parts of the world, and there is still extant a correspondence which is said to have passed between Joseph and Hasdai ibn Shaprut, an official at the court of Cordova. The authenticity of Hasdai's letter has been challenged, and Landau makes a thorough investigation of this point, reaching the conclusion that, while the letter is in substance the work of Hasdai, it was actually written by his secretary, Menahem ben Saruk. In reaching this conclusion the author makes skilful use of the eschatology of the period, and shows some acute critical reasoning on the style of the letter. The second question handled in this little book is that of certain Geniza fragments now at Cambridge, which, apparently, come also from the tenth century, and throw a good deal of light on the relations between the Byzantine empire and the nations to the north and east. The discussion of both these points would have been of more value for the general reader if a brief sketch of the background had first been given, and the documents either quoted in full (Hasdai's letter is a most interesting production) or summarized. As it is, Landau's work will be of value chiefly to experts who have the details of this period always in mind.

It is unnecessary to discuss at length the *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments in heilsgeschichtlicher Entwicklung*, produced by Lic. Wilhelm Möller, with some help from his son, Lic. Hans Möller.¹ The theological position is, naturally, that which Herr Möller and his family have already adopted in their critical work (see, e.g. EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvii. 565). In this new book we have a general statement of the results of their views regarding the Bible. Large sections are taken, one after another, and the doctrines to be derived from each are indicated. As is to be expected, considerable stress is laid on Messianic prediction. The point of view adopted excludes any sense of a developing appreciation of God; the full picture is there from the outset. The first chapter of Genesis contains clear trinitarian theology, and it is characteristic that two hundred and sixty pages are devoted to the Pentateuch. We have the same self-assertion, the same passion for argument, the same bitterness of feeling, the same curious preconceptions, and the same honesty of conviction as those shown in Herr Möller's critical work. But they are less prominent in this book, and there are

one or two passages (especially in the section on the Psalms) from which a number of readers might derive help and profit. But, on the whole, Herr Möller has come no nearer to bridging the gulf between himself and his opponents.

The most recent attack on the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis of the Hexateuch is that launched in 1933 by Volz and Rudolph in their joint work *Der Elohists als Erzähler*. Their thesis was that it is a mistake to include an Elohist document among the sources of Genesis, and their position was argued with learning and skill. To most scholars, however, it failed to carry conviction, though it was generally felt that a final decision could not be given till we had seen how the new theory affected the whole of the Hexateuch. The task has been carried on by Rudolph alone—apparently the two scholars are not agreed on the subject of P in the later books—and we now have the complete work before us.²

It is impossible to speak too highly of the scholarship and of the thoroughness with which Rudolph has accomplished his task. He has handled every passage (naturally laying less stress on obvious P sections) with meticulous care, paying attention even to the smallest points, and discussing fairly the work of his predecessors. The result is a close and detailed analysis of Exodus, Numbers, parts of Deuteronomy and of Joshua, with an appendix on Jg 1¹⁻². More than once it is admitted that the J portion of the text as it now stands embodies variant traditions, and that it is very far from representing the primitive condition of the ancient J document. As a matter of fact, the general result of the analysis does not differ greatly from that normally reached on the Graf-Wellhausen theory; the widest divergences are to be seen in the Balaam oracles and in Joshua. There is in every passage a main thread, ascribed by Rudolph to J; other elements are, for the most part, short sentences or phrases. 'J,' then, includes not only the narratives usually assigned to that source, but also those more continuous sections commonly ascribed to E. The additional elements, which Rudolph does not include under J, are to be grouped under four heads: (i) simple additions, e.g. the Song of Miriam (Ex 15¹⁻¹⁹) and the Blessing of Moses (Dt 33); (ii) insertions made for emphasis on some religious point; (iii) explanatory notes; (iv) passages derived from sources parallel to those found in Rudolph's J. Several sections which might

¹ Herrmann, Zwickau; Geheftet RM.12.50; Leinenband RM.13.50.

² Der „Elohists“ von Exodus bis Josua, by Wilhelm Rudolph (Töpelmann, Berlin; RM.18.00).

have been included under this last head are ascribed to J, who is supposed to have had more than one line of tradition at his disposal, and to have combined what he had.

Since J and E are notoriously more difficult to separate in the later books than they are in Genesis, Rudolph should have had an easier task than he and Volz had in their earlier volume. As a matter of fact, many students will find his position less convincing. The inclusion of variant traditions in J makes that writer a redactor rather than an author, and so merely carries the question of 'sources' one stage further back. More than once the remark is made that additions to the main thread cannot have been drawn from an independent document (*i.e.* from E), because they do not form a connected whole. This would be a valid argument only on the assumption (certainly not made by the

Graf-Wellhausen school) that the redactor ('RJE') must have embodied the whole of all his sources. Several longer pieces (*e.g.* the Golden Calf story) can find no room in the main narrative of J, and we are often left with the feeling that Rudolph's arguments would be valid only if it had been irrefutably demonstrated that E never existed. It will be freely admitted that we have here an alternative explanation of the facts, but a theory can hardly be said to be finally convincing merely because it is not impossible. In the present case it can scarcely be granted that the reasons advanced for the new hypothesis are irresistible, and not a few readers, while fully conscious of their debt of gratitude to Rudolph for his fresh and thorough examination of the details, will still prefer the older view.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

Contributions and Comments.

Deuteronomy xxiii. 25.

מחזן תשפיל-חרב
ומחררים אימה

THE word **אימה** is here usually translated 'terror.' I suggest, however, that in view of the parallel תשפיל it should rather be combined with the Arabic **أيم** 'orbari,' and rendered 'widowhood.'

In support of this interpretation, note that in Is 47⁹ **שכול** is combined with **אילמן**, as again in the Ras Shamra text, *The Birth of the Gods Gracious*, lines 8-9.

In La 1²⁰ the word **אימה** is replaced by **כפוף**. This perhaps reflects a misreading of, or variant to, the original **אמת**.*

THEODOR H. GASTER.

London.

Entre Nous.

The Master of the Temple.

The title which Mr. Harold Anson has given to his volume of Recollections and Reflections (Heinemann; ros. 6d. net) is *Looking Forward*. In the preface he says: 'I have called this book *Looking Forward* because I am not without hope that it may encourage those who may read it, to believe, as I myself believe, that life is abundantly worth living,

not only for its own sake, but as a real preparation for the next exciting stage which awaits us, when our work here is done. I am so glad to have lived, and not sorry to be awaiting the new adventures of another world.' This is a volume which sets out to do two things and does them very successfully—to trace the growth of a personality through the impact on it of various movements and events, and

to show us a pattern of customs and modes of living not likely to be repeated in a new age.

Harold Anson was born in 1867 at Sudbury where his father was vicar. His parents, he tells us, were deeply religious people. They would never have thought of questioning that families were sent by God and that they had no right to control their number. He was one of a family of fourteen. His father was not only vicar of Sudbury but a Canon of Windsor. 'The annual move from my father's country parish at Sudbury to Windsor was a colossal affair, almost like Noah's entering into the ark, except that, so far as we were aware, it excluded the unclean beasts. We moved complete with as many of the eleven surviving children as were not out in the world, about a dozen servants, two horses, two carriages, and dogs and cats.'

Mr. Anson's mother was a daughter of the fifth Lord Vernon. She was brought up chiefly in Italy, in a very luxurious way and in an eighteenth-century atmosphere. She reacted in her youth against a moral code, 'which she saw to have brought great sorrow, even although it brought her among many charming and cultured men.' She underwent a puritan and evangelical conversion, and instead of the brilliant marriage which had been expected, she married her cousin 'whose only desire was to care for her, and his simple village flock.' Mr. Anson tells a very pleasant story of his mother, that she always made a practice of putting a sovereign into the plate at the Sunday service, but, 'lest this should be discovered on the open plate, she made a sandwich of two pennies, one on each side of the gold coin, and I only discovered the secret one day, when the plate was held by a sidesman with a trembling hand.'

As a child Mr. Anson was very delicate, as the result of typhus fever. After a year at a public school his health became worse and he had to leave and after that had a succession of tutors. He stammered badly, also, but he was able to overcome this, attributing this fact largely to his own deep conviction that he was *meant* to be a speaker.

At Bournemouth where he went to stay with an aunt he was influenced by the somewhat narrow form of evangelicalism that he found amongst his aunt's family and friends. He underwent an experience of conversion and looking back on it what he vaguely remembers is the tremendous 'incandescence' of that time, but the experience lasted only a very short period and he felt later that it was an 'attempt to short-circuit the slow and natural unfolding of the spiritual life. . . . The throwing off of evangelicalism as I had known it, was a

step in an effort to find a form of religion into which I could build up the whole of my life without leaving anything of real value outside the door.'

At Oxford he was influenced by Gore and Scott Holland. He threw himself into social work, was president of the Christian Social Union, and later was for a time co-editor with Scott Holland of *The Commonwealth*. His interest in Christian Socialism never waned, but he gradually moved from the Anglo-Catholic position towards Modernism.

Mr. Anson has a pleasant touch of humour and there are a number of stories in the volume. Some are rather old and some rather exaggerated, and here a little gentle pruning would certainly have been an improvement. But one of the stories relating to Christ Church we confess to have a weakness for. 'Just before my time, there had been an old Canon, known as "presence-of-mind" Banes. This name he owed to a story which he was always delighted to tell. You began by asking him if it were not true that he had once nearly suffered shipwreck. "Indeed, yes," he would answer, "I and my friends were rowing on a lake, and one of the party fell overboard. In his struggles to re-enter the boat he nearly capsized us all. But *with infinite presence of mind* I caught him a sharp rap on the knuckles, and he sank, and we all got safe to shore.' He was particularly proud to be able to recount this bold deed.'

Mr. Anson's experiences have been unusually wide. He was a parish priest in town and country. He had a period in New Zealand where he ministered first in a very scattered area and then was Principal of a Theological College for a few years. On return to England he had no settled charge but was chaplain of the Guild of Health. In this connexion his treatment of 'Spiritual Healing' is suggestive. In 1935 he succeeded Dr. Carpenter as Master of the Temple.

But what Mr. Anson is interested in and what we are interested in is the result of his long and varied experience of people and movements—his thought on the subjects that vex men to-day, his attitude to its many crying problems. This we find in his chapters on 'Marriage Problems,' 'Prayer,' and, especially, in the concluding chapter 'A Credo.' Readers will turn to this for themselves, but we take leave to quote a few sentences on personal immortality. 'One is often asked to-day whether one believes in personal immortality. . . . I certainly don't wish to be "absorbed into the Godhead"—whatever that may mean—it seems to me to argue not only a very low idea of what I am, but also of what God is—something like a vast

sponge. Nor is the immortality of the human race a cause which brings me any enthusiasm. So far as I can see, the power behind the universe has taken great trouble to make human beings different. I cannot replace my friend, if he dies, as I could replace my canary, or my pot-plant, by another exactly alike for all practical purposes. It would appear that personality is the highest effort of that great Purpose which the simple-minded of us still call God. Those people that we call the highest and best are most acutely different from one another. Their happiness does not consist in being absorbed into one another, but in remaining consciously separate, though united in love. Why should we then suppose that the universe wants to melt down this elaborate work, and reduce it to the undifferentiated lump? It seems to me exceedingly unlikely. It would appear likely that the quality which is most personal in us is destined to go on to some ultimate perfection.'

The Gospel of Creativeness.

'We are not called, and this I see more clearly than I did, just to imitate Jesus. All imitation is bad, and Jesus would not have us be mere copyists. "Take the holy spirit," He said. We have to grasp His spirit, and become creators of good ourselves, and not copyists.

'If there were no doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Christianity, we might become merely imitators of a past age, looking back continually to the circumstances in which Jesus lived, instead of facing our own circumstances in His spirit.

'It is not the Will of God that we should merely be faithful copyists of a model, pre-ordained for our meticulous efforts to repeat, world without end. We are created to be creators ourselves. Heaven is not a place where we shall enjoy eternal changelessness, but a place in which we shall share in the eternal energy of creation, where God "makes all things new."

'I am sure that this gospel of creativeness needs to be preached far more than it has been in the past. I do not wish to lay less stress upon the redemptiveness of Christianity, its infinite capacity for healing wounds and driving out sin. "Ransomed, healed, restored, forgiven" ought to be a very real experience to every Christian; but that is the beginning and not the end. The end is that he who is ransomed and healed should himself become a creator of new values, through being a partaker in the creative spirit. The neglect of this teaching has made so many religious people listless and dull, and Churches so pathetically anxious as to what they

should do next. I have heard good clergymen say that they can't think what to preach about on Whit-Sunday, having already preached many times about the first Pentecost.'¹

The Problem of Hell.

In the summing up of a discussion in *The British Weekly* on the problem of hell, Dr. Garvie offers a 'provisional conclusion.' We quote a few paragraphs.

'This problem confronted me as a youth sixty years ago, and I cannot forget what toil of mind and travail of soul it cost me, until the Spirit of truth guided me to what for me at least appears to be "the truth as it is in Jesus." . . .

'The words relied upon regarding hell (Mark 9^{47, 48}) are a quotation from Isa 66²³, which is a description of the valley of Hinnom, into which the bodies of criminals were cast, and are evidently used figuratively to describe the penalty of unrepented sin in the future life. That there is such penalty none who accept Christ's authority can question; but a symbol must not be turned into a definition, a metaphor into a dogma. . . .

'It is the revelation of God in Christ which raises the problem. It is many years now since I made it the guiding principle of my theology that I will not believe anything about God inconsistent with the Son's revelation of the Father, nor refuse to believe what can be inferred from that revelation.

'The doctrine of *eternal punishment* in any form is to my Christian reason, conscience and heart an intolerable denial of the love of God as the grace of Christ has imparted it to me, for whom He is Saviour and Lord.

'The doctrine of *conditional immortality*, as often presented with a crude literalism, regarding the meaning of "death" or "eternal" is no less repugnant, although what I shall offer has an apparent resemblance to it, but a real difference. The "larger hope" of *universal restoration*, that at last all shall be saved, may be cherished as a hope, but cannot be affirmed as a certain truth. . . .

'The physical event of death cannot destroy personal identity and continuity of experience and character, nor are we warranted in believing that it must arrest all development, whether for good or evil, or fix finally eternal destiny.

'After death there will be penalty for impenitent sin more severe, manifest and constant hereafter, it may be, than here. There is a terror as well as a tenderness of the Lord. The greatness of God's

¹ H. Anson, *Looking Forward*, 287.

love in the Cross of Christ to save from sin, the urgency and intensity of the appeal of Jesus for penitence and faith, the awfulness of His warnings of what sin involves, all combine to forbid the too sentimental presentation of the Fatherhood of God, which is responsible for a good deal of moral laxity and licence. God's love is holy love; its end is to make men holy.

'As regards the finally impenitent, if such there should be, I am forced to the conclusion that, as the organism which does not respond to its environment perishes, they will, without any divine intervention to annihilate, fade out of personal existence or suffer the eternal death as unfit for, and unworthy of, the eternal life. But it is not the will of the Father that any should so perish.'

Relativism.

'The outstanding characteristic of our time is the complete disappearance of all absolutes, and the victorious but dreadful dominion of the spirit and attitude of relativism. . . . Of course there are ideals. The world bristles with idealisms, noble and ridiculous, pure and demonic, because man cannot live without them. He is an amazingly fertile creator of idealisms, for without them he starves and degenerates. Absolutes, however, there are not, only pseudo-absolutes. These pseudo-absolutes—race, nation, classless society, a "holy" or "eternal" country—clearly demonstrate that man cannot live on bread, on relativism, alone. When he has, consciously or unconsciously, abolished God, he makes another god, because the need for the divine "word" belongs to the essence of man's nature, for he was created by God and unto God. Notwithstanding that, the rule of the spirit of secularism and relativism is unbroken, the modern pseudo-absolutes are even the acme of this spirit, the most intense expression of it.'¹

Isaiah lxxv. 25.

Mr. C. E. M. Joad, writing in *Time and Tide*, says: 'There are ways and ways of celebrating the summer solstice. In England a small number of enthusiasts gather yearly at Stonehenge to watch the sun rise over the great monolith known as the Friar's Heel. In Germany the longest day is celebrated by pilgrims who climb the Hesselberg, Hitler's "Holy Mountain," and after lighting a huge bonfire on its summit, cast their sins, metaphorically speaking, into it and descend, "purged" for the year. At Stonehenge the ceremony is scientific,

traditional, and strictly non-political. No High Priest officiates. On the Hesselberg the ceremony is Nordic to the nth, and has a High Priest whose threats and outbursts this year against Priests, Jews, Czechoslovakians, foreign countries, and the League of Nations were strictly political and combined to make a hymn of Hate which far outdid the venom in the old hymn of that name.

'The prophet Isaiah, when he lifted up his eyes to the hills of his native country, received a very different impression from them than Herr Streicher received from the Hesselberg. How does it run? "And they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my Holy Mountains. . . ."'

Thanksgiving for Trial.

'The mother of John Gurney's beautiful wife,' wrote Amelia (wife of John Opie, the Painter), 'whom he lost a year after marriage—that mother was now following him to his last home, and seeing him deposited by the side of her adored child and husband. We stood opposite to this interesting group, and I could scarcely bear to look at them, yet I could scarcely avert my eyes from them. Then Priscilla (sister of Elizabeth Fry) fell on her knees and uttered I think one of the *very finest thanksgivings for trial*, and mercy vouchsafed the departed dear one, that mortal tongue could speak or mortal mind conceive.'²

'Our Father.'

'A friend of mine, still happily alive, was one day speaking to her friend, the daughter of Karl Marx,' writes Father Vincent M'Nabb in *The Listener*. 'The talk turned, as serious talk so naturally turns, to religion. The daughter of Karl Marx said: "I was brought up without any religion. I do not believe in God." Then she added a little wistfully, "But the other day in an old German book I came across a German prayer, and if the God of that prayer exists, I think I could believe in Him."

"What was that prayer?" asked my friend. Then the daughter of Karl Marx repeated slowly, in German, the "Our Father."

² J. Menzies-Wilson and H. Lloyd, *Amelia, The Tale of a Plain Friend*, 181.

¹ H. Kraemer, *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*.